Joint Design of Overlaid Communication Systems and Pulsed Radars

Le Zheng, *Member*, *IEEE*, Marco Lops, *Senior Member*, *IEEE*, Xiaodong Wang, *Fellow*, *IEEE* and Emanuele Grossi, *Member*, *IEEE*

arXiv:1703.10184v1 [cs.IT] 29 Mar 2017

Abstract

The focus of this paper is on co-existence between a communication system and a pulsed radar sharing the same bandwidth. Based on the fact that the interference generated by the radar onto the communication receiver is intermittent and depends on the pulse train duty cycle and on the density of scattering objects (such as, e.g., targets), we first show that the communication system is equivalent to a set of independent parallel channels, whereby precoding on each channel can be introduced as a new degree of freedom. We introduce a new figure of merit, named the *compound rate* which is a convex combination of rates with and without interference, to be optimized under constraints concerning the Signal-to-Interference-plus-Noise Ratio (SINR) experienced by the radar and obviously the powers emitted by the two systems: the degrees of freedom are the radar waveform and the afore-mentioned encoding matrix for the communication symbols. We provide closed-form solution for the optimum transmit policies for both systems under a variety of conditions, including arbitrary correlation of the interference impinging the radar and/or two basic models for the covariance matrix of the scattering of the interfering objects towards the communication system. We also discuss the region of the achievable communication rates with and without interference. A thorough performance assessment shows the potentials and the limitations of the proposed co-existing architecture.

Index Terms

Spectrum sharing, pulsed radar, compound rate.

I. Introduction

Co-existence between radar and communication systems over overlapping - if not coincident - bandwidths has been a primary investigation field in recent years and has been put forward as a challenging topic at both theoretical

Le Zheng and Xiaodong Wang are with Electrical Engineering Department, Columbia University, New York, USA, 10027, e-mail: le.zheng.cn@gmail.com, wangx@ee.columbia.edu.

Marco Lops and Emanule Grossi are with the DIEI, Universita degli Studi di Cassino e del Lazio Meridionale, Cassino 03043, Italy (e-mail: lops@unicas.it, e.grossi@unicas.it).

and implementation stages [1]–[4]. The prevailing approach so far - with some exception - has been to guarantee the detection and estimation performance of the radar by designing waveforms producing a tolerable level of interference on the communication system.

Some early results concerning the preservation of radar detection capabilities in the presence of co-existing - possibly un-licensed - wireless users have been established in [5]–[7]: the approach taken here relies on maximizing the Signal-to-Interference-plus-Noise Ratio (SINR) in signal-dependent clutter under constraints concerning both the interference produced on overlaid communication networks and similarity with a standard waveform, possibly in the presence of some side information on the environment. A combined approach based on Mutual Information (MI) and SINR is developed in [8]. The philosophy of Dual-Function Radar-Communication (DFRC) relies instead on regarding the radar as the primary function and the communication as a secondary one, whose data can be embedded in the radar waveform [9]–[12]. A more Information-Theoretic approach is instead taken in [13], wherein the object of interest is again the radar, dealt with through MI, under the constraint that it does not produce excessive interference on the coexisting communication system. The attention is steered back to the performance of the communication system in [14], wherein Matrix-Completion based MIMO radars are made to co-exist with wireless systems by constraining the average capacity of the latter, while minimizing a measure of the interference induced on the former. Communications and Radar functions are likewise given equal weight in [15], [16], aimed at investigating the interplay between the estimation accuracy in target localization on the delay-doppler plane and the performance of a multiple-access coexisting system, characterized through the rate achievability regions of the active users.

The present contribution is aimed at further investigating the achievable performance of spectrally overlapping radar and communication systems by conjugating the detection-based approach of [5]–[7] and [10]–[12] with the more recent trends safeguarding also the communication rate. The approach we propose relies on the fact that, while the interference produced by the communication system onto the radar is *persistent*, the interference produced by the radar onto the communication link is *intermittent*, namely is tied to the *duty cycle* of the transmitted waveforms and to the number of objects reflecting towards the communication system. On the other hand, while the radar system may rely on range-gating to cope with multiple target situations and is typically equipped with clutter-suppression devices, the communication system is completely unprotected against spurious reflections produced by the radar signal and hitting the communication receiver. Considering the scenario of a pulsed radar whose basic pulse is equal to that employed by the communication system (consistent with [14]), the contribution of this paper is two-fold. At the system model level, we show that, exploiting the range-gating induced by the radar onto the communication system, the latter can be viewed as an ensemble of parallel, independent channels, whose maximum rates bounce between that of a possibly fading Additive White Gaussian Noise Channel - call it R_0 - and that of an Interference

Channel - call it R_1. At the design level, we set up the problem of determining the optimum radar waveform and/or communication system code-book as the solution of the constrained maximization of a convex combination of the above two rates called compound rate, subject to the condition that the average SINR experienced by the radar exceeds a given minimum level: we offer closed-form solutions under a variety of conditions concerning both the type of interference generated by the radar onto the communication system and the covariance matrix of the disturbance impinging on the radar. In particular, the design is illustrated with reference to three possible scenarios, i.e.:

a The communication system pre-exists and a radar system is to be overlaid thereupon, whereby the degree of freedom is the radar waveform;

b The radar system pre-exists and a communication system is to be overlaid thereupon, whereby the degree of freedom is the coding matrix;

c The radar waveform and the coding matrix can be co-designed.

We also discuss the achievability region of the pair (R_0, R_1) in scenario [c] as a function of the density of objects scattering towards the communication systems. A thorough performance assessment is also given to validate the proposed approach, showing that the nature of the scattering and the density of the interferers has a deep impact on the performance of the communication system, but remarkable gains can be obtained through co-design especially if the requisites on the radar detection capabilities are particularly stringent: in the authors' mind, this study paves the way to a number of further investigations, involving more complex scattering scenarios and/or multiple transmit/receive antennas for both radar and communication systems.

The paper outline is as follows. Section II is devoted to the signal model and the problem formulation, while section III focuses on the constrained optimization of the aforementioned compound rate under white radar noise, while Section IV is instead concerned extends the results to the case that the radar disturbance is correlated. Section V is devoted to the performance assessment and result validation, while Conclusions and hints for future developments form the object of Section VI.

II. Joint Radar-Communication Model and Problem Formulation

A. Signal Model

In this paper, the joint radar-communication system consists of an active, mono-static, pulsed radar and a single-user communication system: Fig. 1 outlines a scheme of the considered architecture.

We assume that the radar and communication systems share the same bandwidth and sample in a time synchronous manner. The radar is allowed to transmit an amplitude-modulated pulse train with Pulse Repetition Time (PRT) T, each pulse having the same duration $T_c = T/K$ as the symbol duration in the communication system, so that the situation of the overlay is outlined in Fig. 2.



Fig. 1. A possible scenario with two interference sources produced by the radar onto the communication system.



Fig. 2. Example of the overlayed radar and communication. The first row is the transmitted radar signal and the echo from a target whose delay is $5T_c$. The second row gives the received signal of communication. The third row gives the interference between radar TX and communication RX.

Suppose the amplitude of the n-th radar pulse is $s(n)$, so that the length-N pulse train emitted by the radar is

$$\xi(t) = \sum_{n=1}^{N} s(n)\phi(t - (n-1)KT_c), \tag{1}$$

where $\phi(\cdot)$ satisfies the Nyquist criterion with respect to T_c, whereby the bandwidth is $1/T_c$ and K range cells are defined. As to N, we assume that it is chosen in such a way that no range migration takes place in the time interval NT, i.e. that the targets do not change range cell for the duration of the pulse train. The signal transmitted by the communication system is

$$x(t) = \sum_{l=-\infty}^{\infty} x(l)\phi(t - lT_c), \tag{2}$$

where $x(l)$ denotes the l-th transmitted symbol.

If a target is present in a given range cell, it back-scatters towards the radar antenna with a given coupling coefficient a, and hits it with time delay $\tau_k = kT_c$ for $1 \leq k \leq K$, thus generating echoes at time instants $\{kT_c + (n-1)T\}_{n=1}^{N}$: we assume that the targets of interest are coherent (e.g., follow a Swerling 0, 1 or 3 model),

since no signal design could take place for scintillating targets (i.e., Swerling 2 or 4)[1]. Denoting $\tau_{\text{CR}} = \nu_{\text{CR}} T_c$ and g as the delay and the channel gain between the communication TX and the radar RX, respectively, the radar should process the return from the k-th range cell to discriminate between the two hypotheses

$$r(t) = \begin{cases} \sum_{n=1}^{N} as(n)\phi(t-\tau_k-(n-1)KT_c) + \sum_{l=-\infty}^{\infty} gx(l)\phi(t-\nu_{\text{CR}}T_c-lT_c) + \tilde{w}(t), & \text{under } H_1, \\ \sum_{l=-\infty}^{\infty} gx(l)\phi(t-\nu_{\text{CR}}T_c-lT_c) + \tilde{w}(t), & \text{under } H_0, \end{cases} \tag{3}$$

where $\tilde{w}(t)$ is the measurement noise of the radar receiver. The discrete-time baseband equivalent representation of the observations pertaining to the k-th range cell - corresponding to a delay $\tau_k = kT_c$ - after illumination through the pulse train can be obtained by projecting the previous observations onto the orthonormal functions $\bigcup_\ell \{\phi(t-kT_c-(\ell-1)KT_c)\}_{\ell=1}^{N} = \bigcup_\ell \{\phi(t-kT_c-(\ell-1)T)\}_{\ell=1}^{N}$, i.e.:

$$\begin{aligned} r(k+(n-1)K) &= \langle r(t), \phi(t-(n-1)T-kT_c)\rangle, \\ &= \begin{cases} as(n) + gx(k-\nu_{\text{CR}}+(n-1)K) + w(k+(n-1)K), & \text{under } H_1, \\ gx(k-\nu_{\text{CR}}+(n-1)K) + w(k+(n-1)K), & \text{under } H_0, \end{cases} \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

where $\langle\cdot\rangle$ denotes the inner product, $w(k+(n-1)K) \triangleq \langle \tilde{w}(t), \phi(t-(n-1)T-kT_c)\rangle$. Regrouping the returns pertaining to each range cell in N-dimensional vectors, we obtain, for the k-th range cell:

$$\boldsymbol{r}_k = \begin{cases} a\boldsymbol{s} + g\boldsymbol{x}_{k-\nu_{\text{CR}}} + \boldsymbol{w}_k, & \text{under } H_1, \\ g\boldsymbol{x}_{k-\nu_{\text{CR}}} + \boldsymbol{w}_k, & \text{under } H_0, \end{cases} \tag{5}$$

where $\boldsymbol{s} = [s(1), s(2), ..., s(N)]^T \in \mathbb{C}^{N\times 1}$; $\boldsymbol{r}_k = [r(k), r(k+K), ..., r(k+(N-1)K)]^T \in \mathbb{C}^{N\times 1}$; $\boldsymbol{x}_{k-\nu_{\text{CR}}} = [x(k-\nu_{\text{CR}}), x(k-\nu_{\text{CR}}+K), ..., x(k-\nu_{\text{CR}}+(N-1)K)]^T \in \mathbb{C}^{N\times 1}$; $\boldsymbol{w}_k = [w(k), w(k+K), ..., w(k+(N-1)K)]^T \in \mathbb{C}^{N\times 1}$. We assume that the distribution of $\boldsymbol{w}_k$ is $\mathcal{CN}(\boldsymbol{0}_N, \boldsymbol{M})$ where $\boldsymbol{0}_N \in \mathbb{C}^{N\times 1}$ is the vector with all zero elements, and $\boldsymbol{M} \in \mathbb{C}^{N\times N}$ is the covariance matrix. Notice that here the time scale is the PRT, so the vector $\boldsymbol{x}_k$ includes data spaced T apart.

As to the communication system, we denote by h the gain of the channel linking the communication-TX and radar-RX. In practice, h can be obtained through the transmission of pilot signals [17], [18], so is assumed to be known in this paper: it may be the realization of a random gain, thus yielding a block-fading channel, or a non-random constant. We define $\tau_{\text{C}} = \nu_{\text{C}} T_c$ as the delay between the TX and the RX of the communication system. For sure, the communication RX is not equipped, like the radar system, with interference and/or clutter suppression devices: the signal emitted by the radar produces echoes from a number of reflectors, each belonging to a given range-cell, resulting in significant scattering towards the communication RX (see Fig. 1 and 2). However, in an overlay situation the timing information between the two systems is shared, whereby, denoting $\tau_{\text{RC}} = \nu_{\text{RC}} T_c$ the

[1]We assume that the doppler shift, at the radar side, is either known - which is a meaningful assumption for a target confirmation process - whereby it can be compensated for at the receiver side or zero. Such a framework can be generalized to account for unknown doppler resorting to the worst-case design paradigm.

delay from the radar TX to the communication RX and M as the total number of such interferers, the signal received on the communication side can be formulated as

$$z(t) = \sum_{l=-\infty}^{\infty} hx(l)\phi(t - \nu_{\text{C}}T_c - lT_c) + \sum_{m=1}^{M}\sum_{n=1}^{N} f_{k_m,n}s(n)\phi(t - \nu_{\text{RC}}T_c - k_mT_c - (n-1)T) + \tilde{v}(t), \tag{6}$$

where both M and $k_1, ..., k_M$ are unknown to the communication receiver[2], $f_{k_m,n}$ is the reflection coefficient of the m-th interfering object in the n-th PRT, $\tilde{v}(t)$ is the measurement noise of the communication receiver. As to the reflection coefficients $f_{k_m,n}$ they are typically random and will be commented upon later on in the paper. The above model does not rule out, in principle, the case that one of the interferers is a direct path from the radar TX to the communication RX, and the subsequent derivation would hold true in this case too. However, the communication RX usually has some prior information about the position of the radar, whereby the "direct" interference can be canceled through techniques such as beam-forming [19], [20], not to mention the fact that in some cases - such as propagation in urban areas - there are usually obstacles between the radar and communication, so the direct path does not exist. In this sense, the most damaging sources of interference onto the communication system, which, contrary to the radar, has no specific protection, are those produced by reflection of objects - such as strong targets or reverberation - whose angles and ranges are unknown. By adopting the orthonormal basis $\bigcup_\ell\{\phi(t-\nu_{\text{RC}}T_c-\ell T_c\}$, the KN projections of the observations received in the interval $[\nu_{\text{RC}}T_c; \nu_{\text{RC}}T_c + KNT_c]$ can be re-arranged in the form:

$$\begin{aligned} z(k+(n-1)K) &= \langle z(t), \phi(t - \nu_{\text{RC}}T_c - kT_c - (n-1)T)\rangle, \\ &= \begin{cases} hx(k - \nu_{\text{C}} + \nu_{\text{RC}} + (n-1)K) + f_{k,n}s(n-1) + v(k+(n-1)K), & k \in \{k_1, \ldots, k_M\}, \\ hx(k - \nu_{\text{C}} + \nu_{\text{RC}} + (n-1)K) + v(k+(n-1)K), & k \in \mathbb{K}'. \end{cases} \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

with $\mathbb{K}' = \{0, \ldots, K-1\} \setminus \{k_1, \ldots, k_M\}$ and $n = 1, \ldots, N$. The above equation highlights that co-existence induces a form of range gating on the communication system, whereby, regrouping the above observations into K N-dimensional vectors, whose entries represent samples, spaced KT_c apart, pertaining to a given range cell, we obtain the model for the communication signal:

$$\boldsymbol{z}_k = \begin{cases} h\boldsymbol{x}_{k-\nu_{\text{C}}+\nu_{\text{RC}}} + \boldsymbol{f}_k \circ \boldsymbol{s} + \boldsymbol{v}_k = h\boldsymbol{x}_{k-\nu_{\text{C}}+\nu_{\text{RC}}} + \boldsymbol{S}\boldsymbol{f}_k + \boldsymbol{v}_k, & k \in \{k_1, \ldots, k_M\}, \\ h\boldsymbol{x}_{k-\nu_{\text{C}}+\nu_{\text{RC}}} + \boldsymbol{v}_k, & \text{elsewhere}, \end{cases} \tag{8}$$

where $\boldsymbol{z}_k = [z(k), z(k+K), ..., z(k+(N-1)K)]^T \in \mathbb{C}^{N\times 1}$, $\boldsymbol{v}_k = [v(k), v(k+K), ..., v(k+(N-1)K)]^T \in \mathbb{C}^{N\times 1}$, and $\boldsymbol{v}_k \sim \mathcal{CN}(\boldsymbol{0}_N, \sigma_v^2\boldsymbol{I}_N)$ with $\boldsymbol{I}_N \in \mathbb{C}^{N\times N}$ denoting the N-dimensional identity matrix, while $\circ$ denotes the

[2]Here we assume that the interferers' doppler shift with respect to the communication system receiver is zero, i.e. that they are either stationary or in tangential motion. The subsequent results, however, hold true whenever the relevant figure of merit is doppler-independent, as it happens for one of the two major situations considered in this paper, i.e. totally incoherent scattering, which has a particularly important meaning (see Section III). Once again, accounting for arbitrary interference doppler shift would be compatible with the present framework, once a worst-case philosophy is embraced.

Hadamard product, $\boldsymbol{S} = \text{diag}(\boldsymbol{s}) \in \mathbb{C}^{N\times N}$ with diag$(\cdot)$ outputting the diagonal matrix whose elements are the entries of the input vector. As to $\boldsymbol{f}_k = [f_{k,1}, f_{k,2}, ..., f_{k,N}]^T \in \mathbb{C}^{N\times 1}$, it is assumed to obey a Gaussian model[3], i.e., $\boldsymbol{f}_k \sim \mathcal{CN}(\boldsymbol{0}_N, \boldsymbol{R}_{f,k})$, where $\boldsymbol{R}_{f,k}$ is the covariance matrix of $\boldsymbol{f}_k$: in other words, the radar produces a signal-dependent interference onto the communication system, the nature of the reflecting object being encapsulated in $\boldsymbol{R}_{f,k}$.

In principle, the communication system alone would achieve capacity by random coding through independent Gaussian codewords. In a co-existing architecture, a new degree of freedom is introduced, i.e., the covariance matrix $\boldsymbol{R}_x = \mathbb{E}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_k\boldsymbol{x}_k^H\right) = \mathbb{E}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{k-\nu_{\text{CR}}}\boldsymbol{x}_{k-\nu_{\text{CR}}}^H\right) = \mathbb{E}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{k-\nu_{\text{C}}+\nu_{\text{RC}}}\boldsymbol{x}_{k-\nu_{\text{C}}+\nu_{\text{RC}}}^H\right)$ for $k = 1, 2, ..., K$. This form of "rake encoding" corresponds to introducing correlation between coordinates spaced KT_c apart; on a different point of view, it amounts to generating a white $N\times K$-dimensional matrix, inducing the correlation $\boldsymbol{R}_x$ between the elements of each column, and undertaking depth-K interleaving (i.e., transmitting the elements along the rows). Also notice that the subscripts ν_{CR} in (5) and $\nu_{\text{C}}, \nu_{\text{RC}}$ in (8) become now irrelevant, whereby they will be omitted in subsequent derivations.

B. Problem Formulation

In this paper, we investigate the co-design of the radar and communication waveforms. Our objective is to jointly design the covariance $\boldsymbol{R}_x$ and radar waveform $\boldsymbol{s}$ to reduce the mutual interference and improve the performance of both systems. For the radar system, the SINR is used as the figure of merit, which is expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}\rho &= \text{Tr}\left((\sigma_g^2\boldsymbol{R}_x + \boldsymbol{M})^{-1}\sigma_a^2\boldsymbol{s}\boldsymbol{s}^H\right)\\ &= \sigma_a^2\boldsymbol{s}^H(\sigma_g^2\boldsymbol{R}_x + \boldsymbol{M})^{-1}\boldsymbol{s}.\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

Besides the SINR, a pivotal figure of merit used for detection optimization purposes is, in the light of Chernoff-Stein lemma [21, pp.382-384], the pair of Kullback-Leibler divergences between the densities of the observations under the two alternative hypotheses [22], [23]. In particular, if $f_1(\cdot)$ and $f_0(\cdot)$ are the densities of the observations under H_1 and H_0, respectively, the pair $D_{10} = D(f_1(\cdot) \parallel f_0(\cdot))$ and $D_{01} = D(f_0(\cdot) \parallel f_1(\cdot))$ can be interpreted as error exponents of miss and false alarm probabilities in a Neyman-Pearson theoretic environment, but also offer - in the framework of sequential decision rules [24] - guarantees on the Average Sample Number necessary to make decisions. Also, KL divergences have already been validated as more general alternatives to the usual pair P_d, P_f, detection and false-alarm probability, respectively, for waveform design purposes [25]. The following lemma states the connection between the KL-divergence and the SINR.

Lemma 1: Maximizing the SINR ρ is equivalent to maximizing the KL-divergences D_{01}, D_{10}.

[3]The Gaussian assumption will be justified shortly.

For the communication system, assuming that rake-type random coding with Gaussian codewords is used, the rate of the k-th channel bounces between that of an Additive White Gaussian Noise (AWGN) channel, i.e.,

$$R_0 = \frac{1}{N}\log\det\left(\boldsymbol{I}_N + \frac{|h|^2}{\sigma_v^2}\boldsymbol{R}_x\right), \quad \text{nats/channel use} \tag{10}$$

and that of an interference channel. Notice that the overall interference has covariance matrix $\sigma_v^2\boldsymbol{I}_N + \boldsymbol{S}\boldsymbol{R}_{f,k}\boldsymbol{S}^H$. In principle, such an interference might be non-Gaussian (e.g., if the reflectors represent clutter); however, on top of the fact that we are considering low-resolution systems, wherein the Gaussian assumption might be justified, at the design stage and inasmuch as the communication system performance is considered the Gaussian model has strong theoretical motivations (e.g., in the light of mini-max principle [21, p. 298]), whereby we assume it outright, so that:

$$\begin{aligned} R_{1,k} &= \frac{1}{N}\log\det\left(\boldsymbol{I}_N + \frac{|h|^2}{\sigma_v^2}\boldsymbol{R}_x\left(\boldsymbol{I}_N + \frac{1}{\sigma_v^2}\boldsymbol{S}\boldsymbol{R}_{f,k}\boldsymbol{S}^H\right)^{-1}\right) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{N}\log\det\left(\boldsymbol{I}_N + \frac{|h|^2}{\sigma_v^2}\boldsymbol{R}_x\left(\boldsymbol{I}_N + \frac{1}{\sigma_v^2}\boldsymbol{S}\boldsymbol{R}_f\boldsymbol{S}^H\right)^{-1}\right), \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

where $\boldsymbol{R}_f$ is the "worst case"[4] covariance of the reflectors - more on this *infra* -. In this paper, the objective function is the convex combination of the rates in (11) and (10):

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{R}(\boldsymbol{R}_f) &= \beta R_1(\boldsymbol{R}_f) + (1-\beta)R_0, \\ &= \frac{1}{N}\beta\log\det\left(\boldsymbol{I}_N + \frac{|h|^2}{\sigma_v^2}\boldsymbol{R}_x\left(\boldsymbol{I}_N + \frac{1}{\sigma_v^2}\boldsymbol{S}\boldsymbol{R}_f\boldsymbol{S}^H\right)^{-1}\right) + \frac{1}{N}(1-\beta)\log\det\left(\boldsymbol{I}_N + \frac{|h|^2}{\sigma_v^2}\boldsymbol{R}_x\right), \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

where $\beta \in [0,1]$; $R_1(\boldsymbol{R}_f)$ is the communication rate under interferers scattering covariance $\boldsymbol{R}_f$, as given in (11); heretoafter we refer to the measure $\bar{R}(\boldsymbol{R}_f)$ as *compound rate* (CR).

Before proceeding, it is worth commenting on this choice. First of all, notice that the signal received by the communication system can be written in unified form as:

$$\boldsymbol{z}_k = h\boldsymbol{x}_k + \boldsymbol{S}\boldsymbol{f}_k + \boldsymbol{v}_k, \quad k = 1, 2, ..., K, \tag{13}$$

where, for notational simplicity and with a slight abuse, we have kept the same symbol $\boldsymbol{f}_k$ as in (8). The random vector $\boldsymbol{f}_k$ in (13), indeed, follows a Bernoulli-Gaussian model, i.e., $\boldsymbol{f}_k \sim (1-\alpha)\delta(\boldsymbol{0}_N) + \alpha\mathcal{CN}(\boldsymbol{0}_N, \boldsymbol{R}_{f,k})$ where $\sim \delta(\boldsymbol{0}_N)$ denotes that $\boldsymbol{f}_k$ is a deterministically zero vector and $\boldsymbol{R}_{f,k}$ is the covariance matrix of the scattering, when present, as defined above. The value of α is obviously tied to the average number of reflectors present in the scene (and to the duty cycle): if there is no "preferential" range where the reflectors are located, it may be set at the value $\alpha = \frac{\mathbb{E}[M]}{K}$, if side information on M is available, but this is typically not the case. Thus, in the considered scenario, the presence of a co-existing radar system is accounted for by modeling the communication system as

[4]In this paper no form of cognition is assumed, whereby the basic philosophy must necessarily be that of the "worst case".

K mutually independent parallel channels affected by non-Gaussian interference, since the overall interference in (13) has a contaminated-normal distribution with mixture parameter α, i.e.,

$$\boldsymbol{S}\boldsymbol{f}_k + \boldsymbol{v}_k \sim (1-\alpha)\mathcal{CN}(\boldsymbol{0}_N, \sigma_v^2 \boldsymbol{I}_N) + \alpha \mathcal{CN}(\boldsymbol{0}_N, \sigma_v^2 \boldsymbol{I}_N + \boldsymbol{S}\boldsymbol{R}_{f,k}\boldsymbol{S}^H). \tag{14}$$

Now the quantity $N\bar{R}$ can be interpreted as the conditional MI, given the channel state, between the input and the output of the k-th channel when $\beta = \alpha$ and $\boldsymbol{R}_{f,k} = \boldsymbol{R}_f \ \forall k$, but is otherwise different from the average input-output MI $I(\boldsymbol{x}_k; \boldsymbol{z}_k)$. Indeed, denoting χ_k as the indicator of the presence ($\chi_k = 1$) or absence ($\chi_k = 0$) of radar interference, and assuming $\Pr\{\chi_k = 1\} = \beta = \alpha$, we have

$$I(\boldsymbol{x}_k, \chi_k; \boldsymbol{z}_k) = I(\boldsymbol{x}_k; \boldsymbol{z}_k) + I(\chi_k; \boldsymbol{z}_k|\boldsymbol{x}_k) = I(\chi_k; \boldsymbol{z}_k) + I(\boldsymbol{x}_k; \boldsymbol{z}_k|\chi_k). \tag{15}$$

Since

$$I(\boldsymbol{x}_k; \boldsymbol{z}_k|\chi_k) = \beta I(\boldsymbol{x}_k; \boldsymbol{z}_k|\chi_k = 1) + (1-\beta) I(\boldsymbol{x}_k; \boldsymbol{z}_k|\chi_k = 0) = N\bar{R}, \tag{16}$$

the CR is indeed a conditional MI. Moreover, we have

$$\begin{aligned} I(\boldsymbol{x}_k; \boldsymbol{z}_k) - N\bar{R} &= I(\chi_k; \boldsymbol{z}_k) - I(\chi_k; \boldsymbol{z}_k|\boldsymbol{x}_k), \\ &= H(\chi_k) - H(\chi_k|\boldsymbol{z}_k) - \left[H(\chi_k|\boldsymbol{x}_k) - H(\chi_k|\boldsymbol{x}_k, \boldsymbol{z}_k)\right], \\ &= -H(\chi_k|\boldsymbol{z}_k) + H(\chi_k|\boldsymbol{x}_k, \boldsymbol{z}_k) = -I(\chi_k; \boldsymbol{x}_k|\boldsymbol{z}_k), \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

where $H(\cdot)$ denotes entropy and the independence between χ_k and $\boldsymbol{x}_k$ has been exploited. As a consequence $\bar{R}$ is *not* achievable through the proposed encoding scheme. However, since $I(\chi_k; \boldsymbol{x}_k|\boldsymbol{z}_k) \leq 1$, we have that

$$\left| \frac{1}{N} I(\boldsymbol{x}_k; \boldsymbol{z}_k) - \bar{R} \right| \leq \frac{1}{N}, \quad \text{and } \bar{R} - \frac{1}{N} \leq \frac{1}{N} I(\boldsymbol{x}_k; \boldsymbol{z}_k) \leq \bar{R} \tag{18}$$

namely the MI per channel use differs from the conditional MI per channel use by less than $1/N$, where N is the pulse number: we hasten to underline here that, contrary to $\bar{R}$, $\frac{1}{N} I(\boldsymbol{x}_k; \boldsymbol{z}_k)$ represents the maximum *achievable* transmission rate - provided N is large enough. Notice finally that, lacking prior information on α, the chosen value of β (for optimization purposes) should depend on a coarse information (or forecast) on how crowded the scene is. It is finally worth underlining in passing that the choice of decoding NK symbols at a time is *per se* arbitrary. In principle, one might choose to decode KQ symbols, undertaking rake encoding on Q samples spaced PRT apart, with $Q \gg N$: our choice is tied to the fact that choosing $Q = N$, given the assumptions on the radar scenario, guarantees that no range migration takes places and that each of the K channels is either free or interfered for the whole time during which it is used.

To guarantee the detection and estimation performance of the radar, a certain level of SINR is required [26]. We denote $\rho_{\min}$ as the required SINR at the radar receiver and use the CR as the objective function. The joint radar and communication waveform optimization problem could thus be set up in the following form:

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\boldsymbol{s},\boldsymbol{R}_x} \quad & \bar{R}(\boldsymbol{R}_f), \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \boldsymbol{s}^H(\sigma_g^2\boldsymbol{R}_x+\boldsymbol{M})^{-1}\boldsymbol{s}\geq\tilde{\rho}, \\ & \|\boldsymbol{s}\|_2\leq P_r, \mathrm{Tr}(\boldsymbol{R}_x)\leq P_c, \boldsymbol{R}_x\succeq 0, \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

where $\tilde{\rho}=\rho_{\min}/\sigma_a^2$, P_r is the the power constraint of the radar and P_c is the power constraint of the communication.

III. Optimization of radar and communication waveforms in white radar noise

In regard to the optimization problem (19), determining a general and closed-form solution for arbitrary $\boldsymbol{R}_f$ and $\boldsymbol{M}$ appears unwieldy, but a deep insight into the consequences of having the two systems co-exist can be given by considering two important limiting situations, i.e.:

a *Coherent* interference, such as, e.g., coherent targets yielding the Rank-1 matrix $\boldsymbol{R}_f=\sigma_f^2\mathbf{1}_N\mathbf{1}_N^T$;

b *Incoherent* interference, such as scintillating scattering objects with low coherence time, yielding $\boldsymbol{R}_f=\sigma_f^2\boldsymbol{I}_N$.

In this section, we consider, for both situations above, the case that the noise impinging on the radar is white. The case of colored noise is discussed in Section IV.

A. Co-design of Radar and Communication Waveforms Under Coherent Interference

When $\boldsymbol{R}_f=\sigma_f^2\mathbf{1}_N\mathbf{1}_N^T$, the communication rate under interference can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} R_1(\sigma_f^2\mathbf{1}_N\mathbf{1}_N^T) &= \frac{1}{N}\log\det\left(\boldsymbol{I}_N+\frac{|h|^2}{\sigma_v^2}\boldsymbol{R}_x\left(\boldsymbol{I}_N+\frac{\sigma_f^2}{\sigma_v^2}\boldsymbol{s}\boldsymbol{s}^H\right)^{-1}\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{N}\left[\log\det\left(\boldsymbol{I}_N+\frac{|h|^2}{\sigma_v^2}\boldsymbol{R}_x\right)+\log\det\left(\boldsymbol{I}_N-\left(\boldsymbol{I}_N+\frac{|h|^2}{\sigma_v^2}\boldsymbol{R}_x\right)^{-1}\frac{|h|^2}{\sigma_v^2}\boldsymbol{R}_x\frac{\frac{\sigma_f^2}{\sigma_v^2}\boldsymbol{s}\boldsymbol{s}^H}{1+\frac{\sigma_f^2}{\sigma_v^2}\|\boldsymbol{s}\|_2^2}\right)\right] \\ &= \frac{1}{N}\left[\log\det\left(\boldsymbol{I}_N+\frac{|h|^2}{\sigma_v^2}\boldsymbol{R}_x\right)-\log\left(\frac{1+\frac{\sigma_f^2}{\sigma_v^2}\|\boldsymbol{s}\|_2^2}{1+\frac{\sigma_f^2}{\sigma_v^2}\boldsymbol{s}^H\left(\boldsymbol{I}_N+\frac{|h|^2}{\sigma_v^2}\boldsymbol{R}_x\right)^{-1}\boldsymbol{s}}\right)\right], \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

where the last equality follows the fact that $\det(\boldsymbol{I}_N+\boldsymbol{p}\boldsymbol{q}^H)=1+\boldsymbol{p}^H\boldsymbol{q}$ with $\boldsymbol{p},\boldsymbol{q}\in\mathbb{C}^{N\times 1}$, whereby, plugging (20) into (12) and (19), the optimization problem can be reformulated as

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\boldsymbol{s},\boldsymbol{R}_x} \quad & \log\det\left(\boldsymbol{I}_N+\frac{|h|^2}{\sigma_v^2}\boldsymbol{R}_x\right)-\beta\log\left(\frac{1+\frac{\sigma_f^2}{\sigma_v^2}\|\boldsymbol{s}\|_2^2}{1+\frac{\sigma_f^2}{\sigma_v^2}\boldsymbol{s}^H\left(\boldsymbol{I}_N+\frac{|h|^2}{\sigma_v^2}\boldsymbol{R}_x\right)^{-1}\boldsymbol{s}}\right), \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \boldsymbol{s}^H(\sigma_g^2\boldsymbol{R}_x+\boldsymbol{I}_N)^{-1}\boldsymbol{s}\geq\tilde{\rho}, \\ & \|\boldsymbol{s}\|_2\leq P_r, \mathrm{Tr}(\boldsymbol{R}_x)\leq P_c, \boldsymbol{R}_x\succeq 0. \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

In the following, we provide the solutions to the above problem. Note that in practice, we also care about the situations when the communication codebook is fixed or the radar waveform is fixed. Thus, we also discuss the situation when $\boldsymbol{s}$ is optimized under given $\boldsymbol{R}_x$, and $\boldsymbol{R}_x$ is optimized under fixed $\boldsymbol{s}$.

1) Fixed Communication Codebook: For fixed communication codebook, the covariance of the communication waveform $\boldsymbol{R}_x$ is given and we optimize the radar waveform $\boldsymbol{s}$ [5]. The problem can be formulated by (21) with fixed $\boldsymbol{R}_x$. Let $\boldsymbol{R}_x = \boldsymbol{U}\boldsymbol{\Gamma}\boldsymbol{U}^H$ be the eigenvalue decomposition of $\boldsymbol{R}_x$, with eigenvalues $\gamma_1 \geq \gamma_2 \geq ..., \geq \gamma_N \geq 0$, and $\boldsymbol{U} = [\boldsymbol{u}_1, \boldsymbol{u}_2, ..., \boldsymbol{u}_N]$. For the convenience of our derivation, we define $\epsilon = \|\boldsymbol{s}\|_2^2$. Note that $\bar{R}(\sigma_f^2 \mathbf{1}_N \mathbf{1}_N^T)$ increases with $\boldsymbol{s}^H(\sigma_g^2 \boldsymbol{R}_x + \sigma_w^2 \boldsymbol{I}_N)^{-1}\boldsymbol{s}$. For fixed ϵ, we should let $\boldsymbol{s} = \sqrt{\epsilon}\boldsymbol{u}_N$ so that $\bar{R}(\sigma_f^2 \mathbf{1}_N \mathbf{1}_N^T)$ is maximized. Then we need to determine the optimal ϵ. To ensure that the solution to the problem exists, we assume that $P_r \geq \tilde{\rho}(\sigma_w^2 + \sigma_g^2 \gamma_N)$, then the problem becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{0 \leq \epsilon \leq P_r} \quad & \log\left(1 + \frac{\sigma_f^2 \epsilon}{\sigma_v^2\left(1 + \frac{|h|^2}{\sigma_v^2}\gamma_N\right)}\right) - \log\left(1 + \frac{\sigma_f^2 \epsilon}{\sigma_v^2}\right), \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \tilde{\rho}(\sigma_w^2 + \sigma_g^2 \gamma_N) \leq \epsilon \leq P_r. \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

As the objective function is decreasing with respect to ϵ, we should set ϵ to its minimum value. Hence, the optimal radar waveform is $\boldsymbol{s}^* = \sqrt{\tilde{\rho}(\sigma_w^2 + \sigma_g^2 \gamma_N)}\boldsymbol{u}_N$.

2) Fixed Radar Waveform: For fixed radar waveform $\boldsymbol{s}$, we need to optimize the covariance $\boldsymbol{R}_x$. The problem can be formulated by (21) with $\boldsymbol{s}$ fixed. Specifically, if $\boldsymbol{R}_x$ is a zero matrix, then there is no interference from the communication to the radar and $\boldsymbol{s}^H(\sigma_g^2 \boldsymbol{R}_x + \sigma_w^2 \boldsymbol{I}_N)^{-1}\boldsymbol{s} = \epsilon/\sigma_w^2$. Obviously, if $\epsilon/\sigma_w^2 < \tilde{\rho}$, the SINR constraint cannot be satisfied and there is no solution to the problem.

In our paper, we care about the situation when $\epsilon/\sigma_w^2 \geq \tilde{\rho}$. We use the same eigenvalue decomposition as in the previous subsubsection, i.e., $\boldsymbol{R}_x = \boldsymbol{U}\boldsymbol{\Gamma}\boldsymbol{U}^H$. For fixed $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}$, the objective function is increasing with respect to $\boldsymbol{s}^H(|h|^2 \boldsymbol{R}_x + \sigma_v^2 \boldsymbol{I}_N)^{-1}\boldsymbol{s}$, so is maximized at $\boldsymbol{u}_N = \boldsymbol{s}/\|\boldsymbol{s}\|_2$. Notice incidentally that setting $\boldsymbol{u}_N = \boldsymbol{s}/\|\boldsymbol{s}\|_2$ simultaneously optimizes the objective function and the term on the constraint. What is left is to design $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}$. To satisfy the power constraint, we have $0 \leq \gamma_N \leq \frac{P_c}{N}$. After manipulation, the equivalent form of the optimization is

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\gamma_1, \gamma_2, ..., \gamma_N} \quad & \sum_{i=1}^{N} \log\left(1 + \frac{|h|^2}{\sigma_v^2}\gamma_i\right) + \beta \log\left(1 + \frac{\sigma_f^2 \epsilon}{\sigma_v^2}\left(1 + \frac{|h|^2}{\sigma_v^2}\gamma_N\right)^{-1}\right), \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & 0 \leq \gamma_N \leq \min\left\{\bar{\gamma}, \frac{P_c}{N}\right\}, \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

where $\bar{\gamma} = \frac{\epsilon - \sigma_w^2 \tilde{\rho}}{\tilde{\rho}\sigma_g^2}$. Following Jensen's inequality [27], we have that for fixed γ_N, the term $\sum_{i=1}^{N} \log\left(1 + \frac{|h|^2}{\sigma_v^2}\gamma_i\right)$ in the objective function is maximized when $\gamma_i = \frac{P_c - \gamma_N}{N-1}$, $i = 1, 2, ..., N-1$. Hence, the optimization problem

[5] this situation - as well as the one discussed in subsection III-B-1 - has a purely theoretical interest and is intended to show the difference between joint and single optimization, since in fact a non-coexisting communication system should use $\boldsymbol{R}_x \propto \boldsymbol{I}_N$.

reduces to

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\gamma_N} \quad & G(\gamma_N), \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & 0 \leq \gamma_N \leq \min\left\{\bar{\gamma}, \frac{P_c}{N}\right\}, \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

where

$$G(\gamma_N) = (N-1)\log\left(1+\frac{|h|^2}{\sigma_v^2}\frac{P_c-\gamma_N}{N-1}\right) + (1-\beta)\log\left(1+\frac{|h|^2}{\sigma_v^2}\gamma_N\right) + \beta\log\left(1+\frac{|h|^2}{\sigma_v^2}\gamma_N + \frac{\sigma_f^2\epsilon}{\sigma_v^2}\right). \tag{25}$$

Computing the derivative of $G(\gamma_N)$, we have

$$\frac{dG(\gamma_N)}{d\gamma_N} = \frac{A\gamma_N^2 + B\gamma_N + C}{\left((N-1)\sigma_v^2 + |h|^2(P_c-\gamma_N)\right)\left(\sigma_v^2+|h|^2\gamma_N\right)\left(\sigma_v^2+\sigma_f^2\epsilon+|h|^2\gamma_N\right)}, \tag{26}$$

where

$$A = -N|h|^6, \tag{27}$$

$$B = -N|h|^4\sigma_v^2 - (N-\beta)|h|^4\sigma_f^2\epsilon + |h|^6P_c, \tag{28}$$

$$C = -\beta(N-1)|h|^2\sigma_v^2\sigma_f^2\epsilon + |h|^4\sigma_v^2P_c + (1-\beta)|h|^4\sigma_f^2\epsilon P_c. \tag{29}$$

The optimal γ_N can then be determined by checking the condition $\frac{dG(\gamma_N)}{d\gamma_N} = 0$. For the convenience of our analysis, we define

$$\lambda_1 = \frac{-B+\sqrt{B^2-4AC}}{2A}, \tag{30}$$

$$\lambda_2 = \frac{-B-\sqrt{B^2-4AC}}{2A}. \tag{31}$$

Since $A<0$, we have $\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2$. The optimal solution may either be achieved at the critical point or boundary point of $G(\gamma_N)$. Considering different situations, the optimal γ_N is

$$\gamma_N^* = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } B^2-4AC \leq 0 \text{ or } \lambda_2 < 0, \\ \min\left\{\bar{\gamma}, \frac{P_c}{N}\right\}, & \text{if } B^2-4AC > 0 \text{ and } \lambda_2 > \min\left\{\bar{\gamma}, \frac{P_c}{N}\right\}, \\ \lambda_2, & \text{if } B^2-4AC > 0 \text{ and } 0 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \min\left\{\bar{\gamma}, \frac{P_c}{N}\right\}. \end{cases} \tag{32}$$

The optimal γ_is are then computed by $\gamma_i^* = \frac{P_c-\gamma_N^*}{N-1}$ for $i = 1, 2, ..., N-1$. With this, the optimal covariance is $\boldsymbol{R}_x^* = \boldsymbol{U}^*\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^*(\boldsymbol{U}^*)^H$ where $\boldsymbol{U}^* = [\boldsymbol{u}_1, \boldsymbol{u}_2, ..., \boldsymbol{u}_{N-1}, \boldsymbol{s}/\|\boldsymbol{s}\|_2]$ and $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^* = \text{diag}([\gamma_1^*, \gamma_2^*, ..., \gamma_N^*])$.

3) Joint Optimization of Radar and Communication Waveform: For the joint optimization of radar and communication waveforms, the problem can be formulated by (21). Following the same line of derivation, it can be obtained that the objective function is maximized at $\boldsymbol{u}_N = \boldsymbol{s}/\|\boldsymbol{s}\|_2$, so the optimization is transformed to

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\gamma_1,\gamma_2,...,\gamma_N,\epsilon} \quad & \sum_{i=1}^{N}\log\left(1+\frac{|h|^2}{\sigma_v^2}\gamma_i\right) - \beta\log\left(\frac{1+\frac{\sigma_f^2}{\sigma_v^2}\epsilon}{1+\frac{\sigma_f^2\epsilon}{\sigma_v^2}\left(1+\frac{|h|^2}{\sigma_v^2}\gamma_N\right)^{-1}}\right), \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & 0 \leq \gamma_N \leq \bar{\gamma}, 0 \leq \epsilon \leq P_r, \\ & \sum_{i=1}^{N}\gamma_i \leq P_c. \end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

We assume $P_r/\sigma_w^2 \geq \tilde{\rho}$ so that the solution to the optimization exists. Note that the objective function decreases with ϵ. For fixed γ_N, we have the optimized parameters $\epsilon = \min\left\{P_r, \tilde{\rho}(\sigma_w^2 + \sigma_g^2\gamma_N)\right\}$ and $\gamma_i = \frac{P_c - \gamma_N}{N-1}$ for $i = 1, 2, ..., N-1$. In the case of $\epsilon = \tilde{\rho}(\sigma_w^2 + \sigma_g^2\gamma_N)$, we plug the value of ϵ and γ_is into (33), and the problem can be transformed to

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\gamma_N} \quad & \tilde{G}(\gamma_N), \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & 0 \leq \gamma_N \leq \frac{P_c}{N}, \end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{G}(\gamma_N) \;=\; & (N-1)\log\left(1 + \frac{|h|^2}{\sigma_v^2}\frac{P_c - \gamma_N}{N-1}\right) + (1-\beta)\log\left(1 + \frac{|h|^2}{\sigma_v^2}\gamma_N\right) \\ & -\beta\log\left(1 + \frac{\sigma_f^2\tilde{\rho}(\sigma_w^2 + \sigma_g^2\gamma_N)}{\sigma_v^2}\right) + \beta\log\left(1 + \frac{|h|^2}{\sigma_v^2}\gamma_N + \frac{\sigma_f^2\tilde{\rho}(\sigma_w^2 + \sigma_g^2\gamma_N)}{\sigma_v^2}\right). \end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

Computing the derivative of $\tilde{G}(\gamma_N)$ with respect to γ_N, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\tilde{G}(\gamma_N)}{d\gamma_N} \;=\; & \frac{1}{\left(\sigma_v^2(N-1) + |h|^2(P_c - \gamma_N)\right)\left(\sigma_v^2 + |h|^2\gamma_N\right)\left(\sigma_v^2 + \sigma_f^2\tilde{\rho}(\sigma_w^2 + \sigma_g^2\gamma_N)\right)} \\ & \times\frac{\tilde{A}\gamma_N^3 + \tilde{B}\gamma_N^2 + \tilde{C}\gamma_N + \tilde{D}}{\left(\sigma_v^2 + |h|^2\gamma_N + \sigma_f^2\tilde{\rho}(\sigma_w^2 + \sigma_g^2\gamma_N)\right)}, \end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

where the coefficients $\tilde{A}, \tilde{B}, \tilde{C}, \tilde{D}$ are given in Appendix A as a function of the system parameters.

The optimal γ_N can then be determined by checking the condition of $\frac{d\tilde{G}(\gamma_N)}{d\gamma_N} = 0$. For the convenience of our analysis, we define $p = \frac{\tilde{C}}{\tilde{A}} - \frac{\tilde{B}^2}{3\tilde{A}^2}$, $q = \frac{\tilde{D}}{\tilde{A}} + \frac{2\tilde{B}^3}{27\tilde{A}^3} - \frac{\tilde{B}\tilde{C}}{3\tilde{A}^2}$ and $\Delta = (q/2)^2 + (p/3)^3$. According to the Cardano's formula [28], if $\Delta > 0$, there is only one real solution which is

$$\tilde{\lambda}_1 = \sqrt[3]{-\frac{q}{2} + \sqrt{\left(\frac{q}{2}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{p}{3}\right)^3}} + \sqrt[3]{-\frac{q}{2} - \sqrt{\left(\frac{q}{2}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{p}{3}\right)^3}} - \frac{\tilde{B}}{3\tilde{A}}. \tag{37}$$

If $\Delta \leq 0$, there are three solutions $\tilde{\lambda}_1$, $\tilde{\lambda}_2$ and $\tilde{\lambda}_3$. $\tilde{\lambda}_1$ is given by (37) while $\tilde{\lambda}_2$ and $\tilde{\lambda}_3$ are given by

$$\tilde{\lambda}_2 = \omega_1\sqrt[3]{-\frac{q}{2} + \sqrt{\left(\frac{q}{2}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{p}{3}\right)^3}} + \omega_2\sqrt[3]{-\frac{q}{2} - \sqrt{\left(\frac{q}{2}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{p}{3}\right)^3}} - \frac{\tilde{B}}{3\tilde{A}}, \tag{38}$$

$$\tilde{\lambda}_3 = \omega_2\sqrt[3]{-\frac{q}{2} + \sqrt{\left(\frac{q}{2}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{p}{3}\right)^3}} + \omega_1\sqrt[3]{-\frac{q}{2} - \sqrt{\left(\frac{q}{2}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{p}{3}\right)^3}} - \frac{\tilde{B}}{3\tilde{A}}, \tag{39}$$

where $\omega_1 = \frac{-1-\sqrt{3}i}{2}$, $\omega_2 = \frac{-1+\sqrt{3}i}{2}$. We define $\zeta(\gamma_N) = \tilde{A}\gamma_N^3 + \tilde{B}\gamma_N^2 + \tilde{C}\gamma_N + \tilde{D}$. Since $\tilde{A} < 0$, $\zeta(\gamma_N)$ is an increasing function for $\gamma_N \in (-\infty, \lambda_3] \cup [\lambda_2, \lambda_1]$ and a decreasing function in the other intervals. Hence, the optimal point can be either λ_1 or λ_3 if we do not consider the other constraints on the value of γ_N.

The optimal solution also needs to satisfy the other constraints such as $\gamma_N \geq 0$ and $\gamma_N \leq P_c/N$. Considering all the constraints, we have that if $\Delta > 0$, the optimal solution is

$$\tilde{\gamma}_N = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } \tilde{\lambda}_1 \leq 0, \\ \tilde{\lambda}_1, & \text{if } 0 < \tilde{\lambda}_1 < P_c/N, \\ P_c/N, & \text{if } \tilde{\lambda}_1 \geq P_c/N. \end{cases} \tag{40}$$

If $\Delta \leq 0$, we denote $\bar{\lambda} = \min\left\{\tilde{\lambda}_2, \tilde{\lambda}_3\right\}$ and obtain the optimal solution

$$\tilde{\gamma}_N = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } \tilde{\lambda}_1 \leq 0, \\ \tilde{\lambda}_1, & \text{if } 0 < \tilde{\lambda}_1 \leq P_c/N, \bar{\lambda} \leq 0, \\ P_c/N, & \text{if } \tilde{\lambda}_1 > P_c/N, \bar{\lambda} \leq 0, \\ \tilde{\lambda}_1, & \text{if } 0 < \bar{\lambda} < \tilde{\lambda}_1 \leq P_c/N, \bar{\lambda} \geq 0, \tilde{G}(\tilde{\lambda}_1) \geq \tilde{G}(\bar{\lambda}), \\ \bar{\lambda}, & \text{if } 0 < \bar{\lambda} < \tilde{\lambda}_1 \leq P_c/N, \bar{\lambda} \geq 0, \tilde{G}(\tilde{\lambda}_1) < \tilde{G}(\bar{\lambda}), \\ P_c/N, & \text{if } 0 < \bar{\lambda} \leq P_c/N, \tilde{\lambda}_1 > P_c/N, \tilde{G}(P_c/N) \geq \tilde{G}(\bar{\lambda}), \\ \bar{\lambda}, & \text{if } 0 < \bar{\lambda} \leq P_c/N, \tilde{\lambda}_1 > P_c/N, \tilde{G}(P_c/N) < \tilde{G}(\bar{\lambda}), \\ P_c/N, & \text{if } \tilde{\lambda}_1 > \bar{\lambda} > P_c/N. \end{cases} \tag{41}$$

Note that the above results are based on the assumption of $\epsilon = \tilde{\rho}(\sigma_w^2 + \sigma_g^2\tilde{\gamma}_N) \leq P_r$. If the condition holds, we obtain $\gamma_N^* = \tilde{\gamma}_N$. Otherwise, the problem reduces to (23) with $\epsilon = P_r$. The optimal γ_N is given by (32) with $\bar{\gamma} = \frac{P_r - \sigma_w^2\tilde{\rho}}{\tilde{\rho}\sigma_g^2}$. On this basis, we have $\gamma_i^* = \frac{P_c - \gamma_N^*}{N-1}$ for $i = 1, 2, ..., N-1$. On the radar side, the optimal waveform is $\boldsymbol{s}^* = \sqrt{\tilde{\rho}(\sigma_w^2 + \sigma_g^2\gamma_N^*)}\boldsymbol{u}_N$. The optimal covariance of communication is then given by $\boldsymbol{R}_x^* = \boldsymbol{U}^*\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^*(\boldsymbol{U}^*)^H$ where $\boldsymbol{U}^* = [\boldsymbol{u}_1, \boldsymbol{u}_2, ..., \boldsymbol{u}_N]$ and $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^* = \text{diag}([\gamma_1^*, \gamma_2^*, ..., \gamma_N^*])$.

B. Co-design of Radar and Communication Waveforms Under Incoherent Interference

When $\boldsymbol{R}_f = \sigma_f^2\boldsymbol{I}_N$, the communication rate under interference can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} R_1(\sigma_f^2\boldsymbol{I}_N) &= \frac{1}{N}\log\det\left(\boldsymbol{I}_N + |h|^2\boldsymbol{R}_x\left(\sigma_v^2\boldsymbol{I}_N + \sigma_f^2\boldsymbol{S}\boldsymbol{S}^H\right)^{-1}\right), \\ &= \frac{1}{N}\log\det\left(\boldsymbol{I}_N + \frac{|h|^2}{\sigma_v^2 + \sigma_f^2\epsilon}\boldsymbol{R}_x\right), \end{aligned} \tag{42}$$

where $\epsilon = \|\boldsymbol{s}\|_2^2$, whereby, plugging (42) into (12) and (19), the joint waveform optimization problem can be reformulated as

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\boldsymbol{s}, \boldsymbol{R}_x} \quad & (1-\beta)\log\det\left(\boldsymbol{I}_N + \frac{|h|^2}{\sigma_v^2}\boldsymbol{R}_x\right) + \beta\log\det\left(\boldsymbol{I}_N + \frac{|h|^2}{\sigma_v^2 + \sigma_f^2\epsilon}\boldsymbol{R}_x\right), \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \boldsymbol{s}^H(\sigma_g^2\boldsymbol{R}_x + \boldsymbol{I}_N)^{-1}\boldsymbol{s} \geq \tilde{\rho}, \\ & \|\boldsymbol{s}\|_2 \leq P_r, \text{Tr}(\boldsymbol{R}_x) \leq P_c, \boldsymbol{R}_x \succeq 0. \end{aligned} \tag{43}$$

1) Fixed Communication Codebook: For fixed communication codebook, the covariance of the communication waveform $\boldsymbol{R}_x$ is given and we optimize the radar waveform $\boldsymbol{s}$. The problem can be formulated by (43) with fixed $\boldsymbol{R}_x$. Note that the objective function decreases with ϵ. To minimize ϵ, we should let $\boldsymbol{s} = \sqrt{\epsilon}\boldsymbol{u}_N$ so that the constraints can be satisfied with the smallest ϵ. To ensure that the solution exists, we assume that $P_r \geq \tilde{\rho}(\sigma_w^2 + \sigma_g^2\gamma_N)$, and the problem becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{0\leq\epsilon\leq P_r} \quad & \epsilon, \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \tilde{\rho}(\sigma_w^2 + \sigma_g^2\gamma_N) \leq \epsilon \leq P_r. \end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

Obviously, the optimal radar waveform is $\boldsymbol{s}^* = \sqrt{\tilde{\rho}(\sigma_w^2 + \sigma_g^2\gamma_N)}\boldsymbol{u}_N$.

2) Fixed Radar Waveform: For fixed radar waveform $\boldsymbol{s}$, we need to optimize the covariance $\boldsymbol{R}_x$. The problem can be formulated by (43) with fixed $\boldsymbol{s}$. Obviously, if $\epsilon/\sigma_w^2 < \tilde{\rho}$, the SINR constraint cannot be satisfied and there is no solution to the problem. Hence, we care about the situation when $\epsilon/\sigma_w^2 \geq \tilde{\rho}$. Suppose $\boldsymbol{R}_x = \boldsymbol{U}\boldsymbol{\Gamma}\boldsymbol{U}^H$, we note that $\boldsymbol{U}$ does not affect the objective function. For fixed $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}$, the radar SINR is maximized at $\boldsymbol{u}_N = \boldsymbol{s}/\|\boldsymbol{s}\|_2$. The next step is to design $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}$. To satisfy the power constraint, we have $0 \leq \gamma_N \leq \frac{P_c}{N}$. After manipulation, the equivalent form of the optimization is

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\gamma_1,\gamma_2,...,\gamma_N} \quad & (1-\beta)\sum_{i=1}^{N}\log\left(1+\frac{|h|^2}{\sigma_v^2}\gamma_i\right) + \beta\sum_{i=1}^{N}\log\left(1+\frac{|h|^2}{\sigma_v^2+\sigma_f^2\epsilon}\gamma_i\right), \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & 0 \leq \gamma_N \leq \min\left\{\bar{\gamma}, \frac{P_c}{N}\right\}, \end{aligned} \tag{45}$$

where $\bar{\gamma} = \frac{\epsilon-\sigma_w^2\tilde{\rho}}{\tilde{\rho}\sigma_g^2}$. Following Jensen's inequality [27], we have that for fixed γ_N, the term $\sum_{i=1}^{N}\log\left(1+\frac{|h|^2}{\sigma_v^2}\gamma_i\right)$ in the objective function is maximized when $\gamma_i = \frac{P_c-\gamma_N}{N-1}$, $i = 1, 2, ..., N-1$. Hence, the optimization problem reduces to

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\gamma_N} \quad & G(\gamma_N), \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & 0 \leq \gamma_N \leq \min\left\{\bar{\gamma}, \frac{P_c}{N}\right\}, \end{aligned} \tag{46}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} G(\gamma_N) \quad = \quad & (1-\beta)(N-1)\log\left(1+\frac{|h|^2}{\sigma_v^2}\frac{P_c-\gamma_N}{N-1}\right) + \beta(N-1)\log\left(1+\frac{|h|^2}{\sigma_v^2+\epsilon\sigma_f^2}\frac{P_c-\gamma_N}{N-1}\right) \\ & +(1-\beta)\log\left(1+\frac{|h|^2}{\sigma_v^2}\gamma_N\right) + \beta\log\left(1+\frac{|h|^2}{\sigma_v^2+\epsilon\sigma_f^2}\gamma_N\right). \end{aligned} \tag{47}$$

Note that $G(\gamma_N)$ is an increasing function with respect to γ_N. The optimal solution becomes $\gamma_N^* = \min\left\{\bar{\gamma}, \frac{P_c}{N}\right\}$ and $\gamma_i^* = \frac{P_c-\gamma_N^*}{N-1}$ for $i = 1, 2, ..., N-1$. As a result, the optimized covariance is $\boldsymbol{R}_x^* = \boldsymbol{U}^*\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^*(\boldsymbol{U}^*)^H$ where $\boldsymbol{U}^* = [\boldsymbol{u}_1, \boldsymbol{u}_2, ..., \boldsymbol{u}_{N-1}, \boldsymbol{s}/\|\boldsymbol{s}\|_2]$ and $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^* = \text{diag}([\gamma_1^*, \gamma_2^*, ..., \gamma_N^*])$.

3) Joint Optimization of Radar and Communication Waveform: For the joint optimization of radar and communication waveforms, the problem can be formulated by (21). The radar SINR is maximized at $\boldsymbol{u}_N = \boldsymbol{s}/\|\boldsymbol{s}\|_2$, so the optimization is transformed to

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\epsilon,\gamma_1,\gamma_2,...,\gamma_N} \quad & (1-\beta)\sum_{i=1}^{N}\log\left(1+\frac{|h|^2}{\sigma_v^2}\gamma_i\right)+\beta\sum_{i=1}^{N}\log\left(1+\frac{|h|^2}{\sigma_v^2+\sigma_f^2\epsilon}\gamma_i\right), \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & 0\le\gamma_N\le\bar{\gamma}, 0\le\epsilon\le P_r, \\ & \sum_{i=1}^{N}\gamma_i\le P_c. \end{aligned} \tag{48}$$

We assume $P_r/\sigma_w^2 \ge \tilde{\rho}$ so that the solution to the optimization exists. Note that the objective function decreases with ϵ. For fixed γ_N, we have the optimized parameters $\epsilon = \min\left\{P_r, \tilde{\rho}(\sigma_w^2+\sigma_g^2\gamma_N)\right\}$ and $\gamma_i = \frac{P_c-\gamma_N}{N-1}$ for $i = 1, 2, ..., N-1$. In the case of $\epsilon = \tilde{\rho}(\sigma_w^2+\sigma_g^2\gamma_N)$, we plug the value of ϵ and γ_is into (48), and the problem can be transformed to

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\gamma_N} \quad & \tilde{G}(\gamma_N), \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & 0\le\gamma_N\le\frac{P_c}{N}, \end{aligned} \tag{49}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{G}(\gamma_N) \;=\; & (1-\beta)(N-1)\log\left(1+\frac{|h|^2}{\sigma_v^2}\frac{P_c-\gamma_N}{N-1}\right)+\beta(N-1)\log\left(1+\frac{|h|^2}{\sigma_v^2+\tilde{\rho}(\sigma_w^2+\sigma_g^2\gamma_N)\sigma_f^2}\frac{P_c-\gamma_N}{N-1}\right) \\ & +(1-\beta)\log\left(1+\frac{|h|^2}{\sigma_v^2}\gamma_N\right)+\beta\log\left(1+\frac{|h|^2\gamma_N}{\sigma_v^2+\tilde{\rho}(\sigma_w^2+\sigma_g^2\gamma_N)\sigma_f^2}\right). \end{aligned} \tag{50}$$

Notice that, unlike the case of coherent interference, here the resulting equation of $\frac{d\tilde{G}(\gamma_N)}{d\gamma_N} = 0$ is in general of degree larger than 4, which means that it can be efficiently solved through numerical methods, but the maximum value does not otherwise admit a closed-form expression. After obtaining the optimal solution, we need to verify whether they satisfy the constraints of $0 \le \gamma_N \le P_c/N$ and $0 \le \epsilon \le P_r$. If not, the problem degrades to (45) with $\epsilon = P_r$. Suppose γ_N^* and $\gamma_i^* = \frac{P_c-\gamma_N^*}{N-1}$ for $i = 1, 2, ..., N-1$ are the optimal eigenvalues. On the radar side, the optimal waveform is $\boldsymbol{s}^* = \sqrt{\tilde{\rho}(\sigma_w^2+\sigma_g^2\gamma_N^*)}\boldsymbol{u}_N$. The optimal covariance of communication is then given by $\boldsymbol{R}_x^* = \boldsymbol{U}^*\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^*(\boldsymbol{U}^*)^H$ where $\boldsymbol{U}^* = [\boldsymbol{u}_1, \boldsymbol{u}_2, ..., \boldsymbol{u}_N]$ and $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^* = \text{diag}([\gamma_1^*, \gamma_2^*, ..., \gamma_N^*])$.

Suppose the optimal solution to (19) is $\bar{R}^*(\boldsymbol{R}_f)$. The following lemma states the relation between $\bar{R}^*(\sigma_f^2\boldsymbol{I}_N)$ and $\bar{R}^*(\boldsymbol{R}_f)$:

Lemma 2: For $\boldsymbol{M} = \sigma_w^2\boldsymbol{I}_N$, the solutions to (19) and (43) satisfy $\bar{R}^*(\sigma_f^2\boldsymbol{I}_N) \le \bar{R}^*(\boldsymbol{R}_f)$.

The proof of the Lemma is given in Appendix B. As a consequence, if the noise impinging the radar is white, the worst-case situation is that of incoherent interference scattering with a variance σ_f^2 equal to a maximum "nominal" one.

TABLE I

OPTIMIZED COMMUNICATION AND RADAR WAVEFORMS

	Coherent interference		Incoherent interference	
	White noise	Colored noise	White noise	Colored noise
Fixed $\boldsymbol{R}_x$	$\epsilon^* = \tilde{\rho}(\sigma_w^2 + \sigma_g^2\gamma_N)$	—	$\epsilon^* = \tilde{\rho}(\sigma_w^2 + \sigma_g^2\gamma_N)$	—
Fixed $\boldsymbol{s}$	γ_N^* is calculated by (32)	—	$\gamma_N^* = \min\left\{\bar{\gamma}, \frac{P_c}{N}\right\}$	—
Joint design	$\epsilon^* = \tilde{\rho}(\sigma_w^2 + \sigma_g^2\gamma_N^*)$ If $\tilde{\rho}(\sigma_w^2 + \sigma_g^2\tilde{\gamma}_N) \leq P_r$, γ_N^* is given by (41); otherwise γ_N^* given by (32) with $\bar{\gamma} = \frac{P_r - \sigma_w^2\tilde{\rho}}{\tilde{\rho}\sigma_g^2}$	$\epsilon^* = \tilde{\rho}(\phi_N + \sigma_g^2\gamma_N^*)$ If $\tilde{\rho}(\phi_N + \sigma_g^2\tilde{\gamma}_N) \leq P_r$, γ_N^* is given by (41); otherwise γ_N^* given by (32) with $\bar{\gamma} = \frac{P_r - \phi_N\tilde{\rho}}{\tilde{\rho}\sigma_g^2}$, $\boldsymbol{u}_N^* = \boldsymbol{v}_N$	$\epsilon^* = \tilde{\rho}(\sigma_w^2 + \sigma_g^2\gamma_N^*)$ γ_N^* is obtained by solving (49)	$\epsilon^* = \tilde{\rho}(\phi_N + \sigma_g^2\gamma_N^*)$ γ_N^* is obtained by solving (49) with σ_w^2 replaced by ϕ_N, $\boldsymbol{u}_N^* = \boldsymbol{v}_N$

IV. OPTIMIZATION OF RADAR AND COMMUNICATION WAVEFORMS IN COLORED RADAR NOISE

The results of the previous section is based on the assumption that the radar is affected by white noise. In practical systems, the overall interference contains also a fraction of correlated noise, and in fact radar waveform optimization in colored noise is of great interest in radar community [25], [29]. In this subsection, we consider the joint optimization of radar and communication waveforms, i.e., the problem formulated in (19).

Adopting the eigenvalue decompositions $\boldsymbol{R}_x = \boldsymbol{U}\boldsymbol{\Gamma}\boldsymbol{U}^H$ and $\boldsymbol{M} = \boldsymbol{V}\boldsymbol{\Phi}\boldsymbol{V}^H$, where $\boldsymbol{\Phi} = \text{diag}([\phi_1, \phi_2, ..., \phi_N])$ with $\phi_1 \geq \phi_2 \geq ..., \geq \phi_N \geq 0$, and $\boldsymbol{V} = [\boldsymbol{v}_1, \boldsymbol{v}_2, ..., \boldsymbol{v}_N]$, solution of (19) takes advantage of the following lemma:

Lemma 3: For fixed $\boldsymbol{\Phi}$, $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}$ and $\|\boldsymbol{s}\|_2^2 = \epsilon$, $\boldsymbol{s}^H(\sigma_g^2\boldsymbol{R}_x + \boldsymbol{M})^{-1}\boldsymbol{s}$ is maximized at $\boldsymbol{U} = \boldsymbol{V}$ and $\boldsymbol{s} = \sqrt{\epsilon}\boldsymbol{v}_N$.

The proof of the lemma is given in Appendix C.

Lemma 3 enables the optimal design of $\boldsymbol{U}$ and $\boldsymbol{s}/\|\boldsymbol{s}\|$. To maximize the communication rates, we also need to optimize $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}$ and ϵ. For the coherent interference and incoherent interference, our problem reduces to (33) and (48) respectively, with $\bar{\gamma} = \frac{P_r - \phi_N\tilde{\rho}}{\tilde{\rho}\sigma_g^2}$ and σ_w^2 replaced by ϕ_N. We can apply the same steps as in Section III to obtain the solution.

For clarity, we summarize the optimal waveform parameters of different situations in Table I. According to our analysis, the optimal waveforms for radar and communications have the form $\boldsymbol{s}^* = \sqrt{\epsilon^*}\boldsymbol{u}_N$ and $\boldsymbol{R}_x^* = \boldsymbol{U}^*\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^*(\boldsymbol{U}^*)^H$, respectively. Here $\boldsymbol{U}^*$ can be any orthonormal matrix if the radar noise is white, so the key parameters for our design are ϵ^* and γ_N^*. For the colored noise, some extra constraints should be applied to $\boldsymbol{U}^*$, i.e., $\boldsymbol{U}^* = \boldsymbol{V}$.

It would be interesting to study the relation between the achievable region in white noise case and colored noise case. Knowledge of the region of achievable communication rate pairs allows determining the optimal transmission policy for any merit function of the form $Q(R_0, R_1(\boldsymbol{R}_f))$: e.g., if $Q(\cdot)$ is increasing, the solution is the point on the border of the achievable region that touches the level set $\{(R_0, R_1) : Q(R_0, R_1) = c\}$ corresponding to the largest

$c \in \mathbb{R}$. When the communication and radar waveforms are both designed, the achievable region can be expressed as

$$\tilde{\mathcal{S}}(\boldsymbol{R}_f) = \left\{(R_0, R_1(\boldsymbol{R}_f)) : \boldsymbol{s}^H(\sigma_g^2\boldsymbol{R}_x + \sigma_w^2\boldsymbol{I}_N)^{-1}\boldsymbol{s} \geq \tilde{\rho}, \mathrm{Tr}(\boldsymbol{R}_x) = P_c, \|\boldsymbol{s}\|_2^2 \leq P_r, \boldsymbol{R}_x \succeq 0\right\}. \tag{51}$$

For the colored radar noise situation, the achievable region is given by

$$\bar{\mathcal{S}}(\boldsymbol{R}_f) = \left\{(R_0, R_1(\boldsymbol{R}_f)) : \boldsymbol{s}^H(\sigma_g^2\boldsymbol{R}_x + \boldsymbol{M})^{-1}\boldsymbol{s} \geq \tilde{\rho}, \mathrm{Tr}(\boldsymbol{R}_x) = P_c, \|\boldsymbol{s}\|_2^2 \leq P_r, \boldsymbol{R}_x \succeq 0\right\}. \tag{52}$$

Following the proof in Appendix D, we have the lemma below:

Lemma 4: Suppose $\mathrm{Tr}(\boldsymbol{M}) = N\sigma_w^2$. In the case of $\boldsymbol{R}_f = \sigma_f^2\mathbf{1}_N\mathbf{1}_N^H$ or $\boldsymbol{R}_f = \sigma_f^2\boldsymbol{I}_N$, for any $(R_0, R_1(\boldsymbol{R}_f)) \in \tilde{\mathcal{S}}(\boldsymbol{R}_f)$, we have $(R_0, R_1(\boldsymbol{R}_f)) \in \bar{\mathcal{S}}(\boldsymbol{R}_f)$.

According to the lemma, $\tilde{\mathcal{S}} \subseteq \bar{\mathcal{S}}$ in both coherent interference and incoherent interference. Therefore, for fixed noise power in radar, the white Gaussian noise is the worst case for the waveform optimization.

V. Analysis

A. Model and Parameter Values

Notice that the solutions derived in the previous sections depend on many parameters, mainly due to the complexity of the scenario we consider. For reader's ease, we outline the simulation scenario at first and then proceed to the result illustration.

We consider a communication system that, when operating in a non-coexisting mode, may rely on a received Signal-to-Noise Ratio (SNR) per symbol, $\frac{|h|^2P_c}{N\sigma_v^2}$ of 10 dB's, so that its maximum rate is simply the capacity, i.e.,

$$C = \log\left(1 + \frac{|h|^2P_c}{N\sigma_v^2}\right) = 2.4\text{nats/channel use} = 3.46\text{bits/channel use} \tag{53}$$

and we set $|h| = 1$. This is obviously the maximum (un-attainable) rate which is the yardstick we compare our results to. As a consequence our performance measure will be in what follows the compound rate.

On a parallel track, we assume that the radar system is designed in such a way that, when operating in non-coexisting mode, it detects a coherent *standard* target, whose Radar Cross Section (RCS) is exponentially distributed with average value $\sigma_a^2 = 1\text{m}^2$, with false alarm and detection probabilities, P_f and P_d, equal to 10^{-4} and 0.9, respectively. This implies that, if ρ_0 the SNR per pulse received under white noise and no interference,

$$P_d = P_f^{\frac{1}{1+N\rho_0}} \tag{54}$$

whence the *cumulated* SNR at the output of the coherent integrator is

$$N\rho_0 = \frac{\ln P_f}{\ln P_d} - 1 = 86.41 \longrightarrow 19.4\text{dB}. \tag{55}$$



(a) (b)

Fig. 3. Plots of the CR against the required SINR for (a) $\beta = 0.1$ and (b) $\beta = 0.5$.

Concerning the interference, we consider, for σ_f^2, which is the upper-bound to the scattering power of the interferers generated by the radar system onto the communication system, four situations, i.e.:

a Weak interference, $\sigma_f^2 = 0.1$ m^2, implying $\frac{\sigma_f^2}{\sigma_v^2} = 0.1 \longrightarrow -10$ dB.

b Standard interference, $\sigma_f^2 = 1$ m^2, implying $\frac{\sigma_f^2}{\sigma_v^2} = 1 \longrightarrow 0$ dB.

c Strong interference, $\sigma_f^2 = 10$ m^2, implying $\frac{\sigma_f^2}{\sigma_v^2} = 10 \longrightarrow 10$ dB.

d Very strong interference, $\sigma_f^2 = 100$ m^2, implying $\frac{\sigma_f^2}{\sigma_v^2} = 100 \longrightarrow 20$ dB.

Notice that these adjectives are referred to the concept of standard target with average RCS $\sigma_a^2 = 1$ m^2. Finally, we assume σ_g^2, the variance of the coupling coefficient from the communication transmitter to the radar receiver, equal to 1, similar to $|h|^2$.

B. Results on Optimized CR

At first, we study the impact, on the communication system, of the constraint forced on the minimum SINR received by the radar. The results, referring to the cases $\beta = 0.1$ and $\beta = 0.5$ (representing scattering environments with different densities) are represented in Fig. 3, where the CRs are plotted versus the quantity $\rho_{\min}$ for $N = 8$ and standard scattering. Not surprisingly, the impact of the SINR constraint turns out to be rather marginal for coherent scattering under both values of β, while for incoherent scattering the effect is still modest for limited scattering environment (where an SINR of 15 dB's, granting a 75% detection probability of a standard target, only costs a decrease of around 20% as compared to the channel capacity under non-coexisting architecture), while being definitely dramatic in rich scattering environment (say, $\beta \geq 0.5$).

In Section III, we also provided the optimal waveform design when $\boldsymbol{s}$ or $\boldsymbol{R}_x$ is fixed. Note that, for the joint waveform optimization, one may also adopt alternating optimization strategy [30]. The algorithm iteratively solves



Fig. 4. Plots of the optimized CR for (a) coherent interference and (b) incoherent interference. The required SINR is set as 10dB and $N = 8$.

the problem and, at each iteration, one waveform is fixed as the result from the previous iteration and the other waveform is optimized. We compare the performance of the alternating optimization with our proposed joint waveform optimization solution. In the simulation, the alternating optimization algorithm starts with optimizing $\boldsymbol{R}_x$ when the radar waveform $\boldsymbol{s}$ fixed at power P_r, and stops when the difference of the radar power between adjacent iterations is smaller than 1×10^{-3}.

According to the result, the performance of the alternating optimization is similar to that of the joint optimization for coherent interference. However, for incoherent interference, the performance of joint optimization can be much better than that of alternating optimization when β is large. This is because our problem in (19) is non-convex, whereby the alternating optimization algorithm may be stuck at local optimum. As the interference is coherent, the optimal solution can be obtained solving (34), in which $\frac{d\tilde{G}(\gamma_N)}{d\gamma_N} = 0$ can be transformed to a cubic equation with respect to γ_N. As the interference is incoherent, $\frac{d\tilde{G}(\gamma_N)}{d\gamma_N} = 0$ is in general of degree larger than 4, which leads to more local optimum wherein the solution can be trapped, which explains the behaviors shown in Figure 3.

The effect of β and of the interference strength is considered in Fig. 4. In particular, Fig. 4a considers coherent interference, while Fig. 4b focuses on incoherent interference: notice at first the different scales of the vertical axis, indicating that coherent interference entails a maximum loss smaller than 0.2 nats/channel use, while strong incoherent interference may seriously endanger communication even for rather slack SINR constraints and $\beta < 0.5$. The reason is fairly understandable in the light of the fact that the term $R_1(\boldsymbol{R}_f)$ in (12) can be re-written in the form

$$R_1(\boldsymbol{R}_f) \quad = \quad \frac{1}{N} \log\det\left(\boldsymbol{I}_N + \frac{|h|^2}{\sigma_v^2}\boldsymbol{R}_x\left(\boldsymbol{I}_N + \frac{\sigma_f^2}{\sigma_v^2}\boldsymbol{S}\boldsymbol{R}'_f\boldsymbol{S}^H\right)^{-1}\right), \tag{56}$$



Fig. 5. Plots the optimized CR against σ_f^2/σ_v^2 and some values of β. (a) Coherent interference; (b) Incoherent interference. The required SINR is set as 10dB and $N = 8$.

where $\boldsymbol{R}'_f = \frac{1}{\sigma_f^2}\boldsymbol{R}_f$, so that $\mathrm{Tr}(\boldsymbol{R}'_f) = N$. Since, as $\sigma_f^2/\sigma_v^2 \to \infty$

$$\boldsymbol{R}_x \left(\boldsymbol{I}_N + \frac{\sigma_f^2}{\sigma_v^2} \boldsymbol{S}\boldsymbol{R}'_f \boldsymbol{S}^H \right)^{-1} \to \boldsymbol{R}_{x,\perp}, \tag{57}$$

where $\boldsymbol{R}_{x,\perp}$ is the projection of $\boldsymbol{R}_x$ onto the orthogonal complement of the range span of $\boldsymbol{S}\boldsymbol{R}'_f\boldsymbol{S}^H$, we have that, under coherent interference, just one dimension is eliminated (i.e., the optimum matrix places the communication system in the orthogonal complement of the radar signature), while for incoherent interference the orthogonal complement is empty, whereby the corresponding CR is $\bar{R} = (1-\beta)R_0$, namely decreases linearly with β, as highlighted by the "strong interference" and "very strong interference" behaviors of Fig. 4b. In general, rank-p interference, with $1 \leq p \leq N$ costs sacrificing p dimensions under very strong interference and thus the limiting decreases accordingly.

This behavior is confirmed by the curves of Fig. 5a and 5b, representing the CR achievable under coherent and incoherent interference, respectively, for some values of β and varying σ_f^2/σ_v^2. As expected, incoherent interference is much more detrimental than coherent interference, but in both cases the "strong interference" condition is reached pretty soon, i.e. for $\frac{\sigma_f^2}{\sigma_v^2}$ in the order of 10dB's.

The effect of the pulse number is finally studied in Tables II and III for coherent and incoherent interference, respectively.

These tables should be read and interpreted in the light of (18). In particular, the CR turns out to be an increasing function of N. Notice however that it is *not* a rate achievable through the proposed encoding scheme, because it is a conditional MI (of a non-Gaussian channel): however, since its distance with respect to the MI per channel use decreases as $\frac{1}{N}$, tables II and III give an idea of the transmission rates *achievable* by the communication system

TABLE II

OPTIMIZED $\bar{R}$ [NATS/CHANNEL USE] UNDER COHERENT INTERFERENCE

	Weak interference		Strong interference	
N	$\beta = 0.1$	$\beta = 0.5$	$\beta = 0.1$	$\beta = 0.5$
2	2.30	1.98	2.27	1.84
4	2.35	2.20	2.34	2.13
8	2.37	2.30	2.37	2.27
16	2.39	2.35	2.38	2.33
32	2.39	2.37	2.39	2.37

TABLE III

OPTIMIZED $\bar{R}$ [NATS/CHANNEL USE] UNDER INCOHERENT INTERFERENCE

	Weak interference		Strong interference	
N	$\beta = 0.1$	$\beta = 0.5$	$\beta = 0.1$	$\beta = 0.5$
2	2.21	1.56	2.13	1.19
4	2.22	1.76	2.15	1.20
8	2.23	1.94	2.16	1.20
16	2.25	2.02	2.16	1.20
32	2.29	2.06	2.16	1.22

through Gaussian random coding employing the matrix $\boldsymbol{R}_x$ for varying β and target strength. For example, Table II reveals that, if $0.1K$ coherent targets interfere with the communication system, then using a train pulse of length 32 makes it possible to achieve a transmission rate, R say, $2.35 \leq R \leq 2.39$ nats/channel[6] use under both weak and strong interferers, a figure which becomes $2.15 \leq R \leq 2.27$ nats/channel use for $N = 8$, $\beta = .5$ and strong coherent interfering targets. Conversely, Table III reveals that, even setting $N = 32$, the communication rate comes down to $1.19 \leq R \leq 1.22$ nats/channel use - about half the rate the system could sustain in non-coexisting mode- under the (extremely severe, indeed) situation of strong incoherent-scattering interferers occupying half the range cells (i.e., $\beta = 0.5$). Needless to say, communication under this last condition would be completely impossible if we forced a more demanding SINR constraint.

C. On the choice of β

The above results rely on the assumptions that the value β of the interferers density assumed at the design stage coincides with the real value $\alpha = \mathbb{E}[M]/K$, defined in Section II-B. On the other hand, a more realistic scenario

[6]We remind here however that $N = 32$ could not be enough to enforce the asymptotic behavior the channel coding theorem relies upon. All the subsequent considerations should be read in the light of this fact.

is one wherein the two parameters differ, whereby a robust choice is in order. To be more precise, assume that the system has been optimized with reference to a given value β by solving (19) with $\bar{R}$ defined in (12). If the actual interferers density is α, then the achieved CR is

$$\bar{R}(\alpha,\beta) = (1-\alpha)R_0(\beta) + \alpha R_1(\beta) \leq \bar{R}(\beta,\beta), \tag{58}$$

where, with a slight notational abuse, we have denoted $\bar{R}(\beta,\beta)$ the optimum CR resulting from the solution of (19) and $\bar{R}(\alpha,\beta)$ the achieved CR. Assume that α is allowed to vary in an interval $[\alpha_1,\alpha_2] \subseteq [0,1]$, since $R_1(\beta) \leq R_0(\beta)$, we have $\overline{R}(\alpha,\beta) \geq \overline{R}(\alpha_2,\beta)$, whereby $\alpha=\alpha_2$ minimizes the achieved CR. On the other hand, based on (58) we have that $\overline{R}(\alpha_2,\beta) \leq \overline{R}(\alpha_2,\alpha_2)$, whereby a maxi-min choice for β is to set it at the value α_2. As a consequence, the maxi-min value is to be chosen by considering the solutions to (19) with $\beta=\alpha_2$.

D. Results on Achievable Regions of the Rate Pair

We finally illustrate some examples of evaluation of achievable regions for the rate pair (R_0,R_1). We underline here that these regions represent the sets of the achievable transmission rates (R_0,R_1) when the real scattering density α is equal to that assumed at the design stage, β. In particular, Fig. 6 gives an example of the achievable regions when the radar and communication waveforms are jointly optimized. We set $\sigma_f^2/\sigma_v^2=1$ in our simulation. Fig. 6a and 6b differ in the SINR constraint, while N has been set at 2 in order to reduce the computational complexity of the simulations. We also plot the set

$$\tilde{\psi}(\boldsymbol{R}_f) = \left\{ (R_0^*(\beta),R_1^*(\beta,\boldsymbol{R}_f)) : (R_0^*(\beta),R_1^*(\beta,\boldsymbol{R}_f)) = \arg \max_{(R_0,R_1(\boldsymbol{R}_f))\in\tilde{\mathcal{S}}} \beta R_1(\boldsymbol{R}_f) + (1-\beta)R_0, \beta\in[0,1] \right\} \tag{59}$$

to show the upper borders of the regions.

Of course the shrinking effect of more stringent constraints on the required SINR is visible, but the enlargement of the achievability regions is significant especially for incoherent interference. Notice that looser SINR requirement allows some overlap in the achievable region under the two interference conditions, while no overlapping is allowed for tighter SINR constraints: the importance of this overlapping is that there are rate pairs which are achievable under both coherent and incoherent interference, which means that they are achievable under any scattering condition. Notice however that $\tilde{\psi}(\sigma_f^2\boldsymbol{I}_N)$ becomes two extreme points of the achievable region when the required SINR is high, as a consequence of the non-convexity of the region: the optimal point switches from one to the other as β changes.

Finally, we study the impact of the correlation of the interference impinging on the radar. In particular, we re-enforce our result that, under both coherent and incoherent interference, white radar noise represents the worst case. For the convenience of our comparison, we define the set

$$\bar{\psi}(\boldsymbol{R}_f) = \left\{ (R_0^*(\beta),R_1^*(\beta,\boldsymbol{R}_f)) : (R_0^*(\beta),R_1^*(\beta,\boldsymbol{R}_f)) = \arg \max_{(R_0,R_1(\boldsymbol{R}_f))\in\bar{\mathcal{S}}} \beta R_1(\boldsymbol{R}_f) + (1-\beta)R_0, \beta\in[0,1] \right\}. \tag{60}$$



(a) (b)

Fig. 6. Example of the achievable region $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}(\boldsymbol{R}_f)$ of capacity pairs: (a) the SINR constraint is $\rho_{\min} = 5$dB; (b) the SINR constraint is $\rho_{\min} = 15$dB. The blue and green shaded area are the achievable region when $\boldsymbol{R}_f = \sigma_f^2 \mathbf{1}_N \mathbf{1}_N^T$ and $\boldsymbol{R}_f = \sigma_f^2 \boldsymbol{I}_N$, respectively, obtained through numerical procedures. The pink line is given by the point set $\tilde{\psi}(\sigma_f^2 \mathbf{1}_N \mathbf{1}_N^T)$. The red cross is given by the point set $\tilde{\psi}(\sigma_f^2 \boldsymbol{I}_N)$.



(a) (b)

Fig. 7. Plot of communication rate pairs for $\tilde{\psi}$ and $\bar{\psi}$ under (a) coherent interference (b) incoherent interference.

As an example of validation, we refer to Fig. 7, representing the upper borders of the achievability regions as derived in Section IV. In particular, we assume $N = 8$. The noise impinging on the radar has covariance

$$M_{i,j} = (\sigma_w^2 - \sigma_c^2)\delta(|i-j|) + \sigma_c^2 \theta^{|i-j|}, \tag{61}$$

with $\sigma_c^2 = 0.5$ and $\theta = 0.5$ This corresponds to assuming that the overall interference consists of a fraction of white noise and a fraction of exponentially-correlated interference. Fig. 7 compares the upper borders of the communication rate pairs achievability regions (sets $\tilde{\psi}(\boldsymbol{R}_f)$ and $\bar{\psi}(\boldsymbol{R}_f)$) when the SINR constraint is 10dB. Once again, incoherent interference with strong interference and white noise turns out to be the most detrimental situation,

while the behavior of the achievability region under incoherent interference and weak interference is quite reassuring in terms of feasibility of coexisting systems.

VI. Conclusions

This paper has introduced a new framework for co-existing radar and communication systems: while the key performance measure for the radar remains the SINR, the performance of the communication system is characterized through a new figure of merit, the Compound Rate, which reflects the intermittent nature of the interference generated by the radar and, form an information-theoretic point of view, is a conditional mutual information of a channel which may be or not subject to interference: this is a direct consequence of the fact that a communication system co-existing with a pulsed radar behaves as a set of independent parallel channels affected by contaminated-normal interference. Considering arbitrary correlation of the radar interference and two fundamental situations of interference generated by the radar (i.e., perfectly coherent and totally incoherent interference), we illustrate the design of the radar waveform and the communication system encoding matrix by maximizing the compound rate under a constraint on the SINR of the radar: the results indicate that the rank of the scattering covariance matrix plays a key role on the achievable performance, since, not surprisingly, totally incoherent interference turns out to be the worst case in a number of circumstances. We also discuss the so-called rate achievability region, i.e. the set of the pairs of rates achievable with and without interference, showing that the situation of white noise impinging on the radar is the worst case under both coherent and incoherent interference.

Further possible developments of this study include, but are not limited to, the discussion of a general maxi-min design under arbitrary scattering correlation, the extension to the case of a high-rate communication system co-existing with a high-resolution radar, which obviously would generate multi-paths of both the primary signals and the interferers, as well as the study of how would these design techniques work for Multiple Input Multiple Output (MIMO) radars, whether with co-located antennas or not. Also, the impact of some cognition of the surrounding scene on the achievable performance could be a topic of great interest, since it would allow releasing the “worst case” philosophy in favor of further optimization.

APPENDIX

A. Coefficients $\tilde{A}, \tilde{B}, \tilde{C}, \tilde{D}$

The coefficients $\tilde{A}$, $\tilde{B}$, $\tilde{C}$ and $\tilde{D}$ in (36) are respectively given by

$$\tilde{A} = -(N-1)\tilde{\rho}|h|^4\sigma_f^2\sigma_g^2\left(|h|^2+\tilde{\rho}\sigma_f^2\sigma_g^2\right)-(1-\beta)\tilde{\rho}|h|^4\sigma_f^2\sigma_g^2\left(|h|^2+\tilde{\rho}\sigma_f^2\sigma_g^2\right), \tag{62}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{B} = & -(N-1)\tilde{\rho}|h|^2\sigma_v^2\sigma_f^2\sigma_g^2\left(|h|^2+\tilde{\rho}\sigma_f^2\sigma_g^2\right)-(N-1)|h|^4\left(\sigma_v^2+\tilde{\rho}\sigma_f^2\sigma_w^2\right)\left(|h|^2+\tilde{\rho}\sigma_f^2\sigma_g^2\right)\\ & -(N-1)\tilde{\rho}|h|^4\sigma_f^2\sigma_g^2\left(\sigma_v^2+\tilde{\rho}\sigma_f^2\sigma_w^2\right)+(1-\beta)\tilde{\rho}\sigma_f^2\sigma_g^2|h|^2\left((N-1)\sigma_v^2+|h|^2P_c\right)\left(|h|^2+\tilde{\rho}\sigma_f^2\sigma_g^2\right)\\ & -(1-\beta)|h|^4\left(\sigma_v^2+\tilde{\rho}\sigma_f^2\sigma_w^2\right)\left(|h|^2+\tilde{\rho}\sigma_f^2\sigma_g^2\right)-(1-\beta)\tilde{\rho}\sigma_f^2\sigma_g^2|h|^4\left(\sigma_v^2+\tilde{\rho}\sigma_f^2\sigma_w^2\right)\\ & -\beta\tilde{\rho}|h|^2\sigma_g^2\sigma_f^2\left((N-1)\sigma_v^2+|h|^2P_c\right)\left(|h|^2+\tilde{\rho}\sigma_f^2\sigma_g^2\right)+\beta\tilde{\rho}|h|^2\sigma_g^2\sigma_f^2\sigma_v^2\left(|h|^2+\tilde{\rho}\sigma_f^2\sigma_g^2\right)\\ & +\beta\tilde{\rho}|h|^4\sigma_g^2\sigma_f^2\left(\sigma_v^2+\tilde{\rho}\sigma_f^2\sigma_w^2\right)+\beta\tilde{\rho}\sigma_f^2\sigma_g^2|h|^2\left(|h|^2+\sigma_f^2\sigma_g^2\tilde{\rho}\right)\left(\sigma_v^2(N-1)+|h|^2P_c\right)\\ & -\beta\tilde{\rho}\sigma_f^2\sigma_g^2|h|^2\sigma_v^2\left(|h|^2+\sigma_f^2\sigma_g^2\tilde{\rho}\right)-\beta|h|^4\left(|h|^2+\sigma_f^2\sigma_g^2\tilde{\rho}\right)\left(\sigma_v^2+\tilde{\rho}\sigma_f^2\sigma_w^2\right),\end{aligned} \tag{63}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{C} = & -(N-1)|h|^4\left(\sigma_v^2+\tilde{\rho}\sigma_f^2\sigma_w^2\right)\left(\sigma_v^2+\tilde{\rho}\sigma_f^2\sigma_w^2\right)-(N-1)\tilde{\rho}\sigma_f^2\sigma_g^2|h|^2\sigma_v^2\left(\sigma_v^2+\sigma_f^2\tilde{\rho}\sigma_w^2\right)\\ & -(N-1)|h|^2\sigma_v^2\left(\sigma_v^2+\tilde{\rho}\sigma_f^2\sigma_w^2\right)\left(|h|^2+\tilde{\rho}\sigma_f^2\sigma_g^2\right)-(1-\beta)|h|^4\left(\sigma_v^2+\tilde{\rho}\sigma_f^2\sigma_w^2\right)\left(\sigma_v^2+\tilde{\rho}\sigma_f^2\sigma_w^2\right)\\ & +(1-\beta)\tilde{\rho}\sigma_f^2\sigma_g^2|h|^2\left(\sigma_v^2(N-1)+|h|^2P_c\right)\left(\sigma_v^2+\tilde{\rho}\sigma_f^2\sigma_w^2\right)\\ & +(1-\beta)|h|^2\left(\sigma_v^2(N-1)+|h|^2P_c\right)\left(\sigma_v^2+\tilde{\rho}\sigma_f^2\sigma_w^2\right)\left(|h|^2+\tilde{\rho}\sigma_f^2\sigma_g^2\right)\\ & +\beta\tilde{\rho}\sigma_g^2\sigma_f^2|h|^2\sigma_v^2\left(\sigma_v^2+\tilde{\rho}\sigma_f^2\sigma_w^2\right)-\beta\tilde{\rho}\sigma_g^2\sigma_f^2|h|^2\left(\sigma_v^2(N-1)+|h|^2P_c\right)\left(\sigma_v^2+\tilde{\rho}\sigma_f^2\sigma_w^2\right)\\ & -\beta\tilde{\rho}\sigma_g^2\sigma_f^2\sigma_v^2\left(\sigma_v^2(N-1)+|h|^2P_c\right)\left(|h|^2+\sigma_f^2\tilde{\rho}\sigma_g^2\right)\\ & -\beta|h|^2\sigma_v^2\left(|h|^2+\sigma_f^2\sigma_g^2\tilde{\rho}\right)\left(\sigma_v^2+\tilde{\rho}\sigma_f^2\sigma_w^2\right)+\beta|h|^2\left(|h|^2+\sigma_f^2\sigma_g^2\tilde{\rho}\right)\left(\sigma_v^2(N-1)+|h|^2P_c\right)\left(\sigma_v^2+\sigma_f^2\tilde{\rho}\sigma_w^2\right)\\ & +\beta\tilde{\rho}\sigma_f^2\sigma_g^2\sigma_v^2\left(|h|^2+\sigma_f^2\sigma_g^2\tilde{\rho}\right)\left(\sigma_v^2(N-1)+|h|^2P_c\right),\end{aligned} \tag{64}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{D} = & -(N-1)|h|^2\sigma_v^2\left(\sigma_v^2+\tilde{\rho}\sigma_f^2\sigma_w^2\right)\left(\sigma_v^2+\sigma_f^2\tilde{\rho}\sigma_w^2\right)\\ & +(1-\beta)|h|^2\left(\sigma_v^2(N-1)+|h|^2P_c\right)\left(\sigma_v^2+\tilde{\rho}\sigma_f^2\sigma_w^2\right)\left(\sigma_v^2+\tilde{\rho}\sigma_f^2\sigma_w^2\right)\\ & -\beta\tilde{\rho}\sigma_g^2\sigma_f^2\sigma_v^2\left(\sigma_v^2(N-1)+|h|^2P_c\right)\left(\sigma_v^2+\sigma_f^2\tilde{\rho}\sigma_w^2\right)\\ & +\beta\sigma_v^2\left(|h|^2+\sigma_f^2\sigma_g^2\tilde{\rho}\right)\left(\sigma_v^2(N-1)+|h|^2P_c\right)\left(\sigma_v^2+\tilde{\rho}\sigma_f^2\sigma_w^2\right).\end{aligned} \tag{65}$$

B. Proof of Lemma 2

Note that (19) and (43) have the same constraints. Therefore, for any $(\boldsymbol{R}_x, \boldsymbol{s})$ pair such that the constraint in (43) are satisfied, the constraints in (19) are also satisfied. According to the result in the previous subsection, the optimal solution of (43) satisfies $\boldsymbol{s}=\epsilon_*\boldsymbol{u}_N$ with $\epsilon_*=\sqrt{\tilde{\rho}(\sigma_w^2+\sigma_g^2\gamma_N^*)}$ and $\|\boldsymbol{u}_N\|_2=1$. For fixed ϵ_* and $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^*$, the value of $\boldsymbol{R}_x$ does not change with $\boldsymbol{u}_N$. For the coherent interference, we assume that $\boldsymbol{R}_f=\sigma_f^2\boldsymbol{I}_N+\boldsymbol{\Omega}$ where $\boldsymbol{\Omega}\in\mathbb{H}^{N\times N}$

satisfies $\text{Tr}(\boldsymbol{\Omega})=0$. Without loss of generality, we assume that $\Omega_{1,1}\leq 0$. Then we set $\boldsymbol{s}=[\sqrt{\epsilon_*},0,...,0]$. In such case, the CR can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{R}(\boldsymbol{R}_f) &= \beta\log\det\left(\boldsymbol{I}_N+\frac{|h|^2}{\sigma_v^2}\boldsymbol{R}_x\left(\boldsymbol{I}_N+\frac{\sigma_f^2+\Omega_{1,1}}{\sigma_v^2}\boldsymbol{S}\boldsymbol{S}^H\right)^{-1}\right)+(1-\beta)\log\det\left(\boldsymbol{I}_N+\frac{|h|^2}{\sigma_v^2}\boldsymbol{R}_x\right),\\ &= \log\det\left(\boldsymbol{I}_N+\frac{|h|^2}{\sigma_v^2+(\sigma_f^2+\Omega_{1,1})\epsilon}\boldsymbol{R}_x\right)+(1-\beta)\log\det\left(\boldsymbol{I}_N+\frac{|h|^2}{\sigma_v^2}\boldsymbol{R}_x\right). \qquad (66)\end{aligned}$$

As $\Omega_{1,1}\leq 0$, we have $\bar{R}(\boldsymbol{R}_f)\geq\bar{R}^*(\sigma_f^2\boldsymbol{I}_N)$. Considering the fact that $\bar{R}^*(\boldsymbol{R}_f)\geq\bar{R}(\boldsymbol{R}_f)$, we have $\bar{R}^*(\boldsymbol{R}_f)\geq\bar{R}^*(\sigma_f^2\boldsymbol{I}_N)$. Hence, the incoherent $\boldsymbol{R}_f$ is the worst case for the optimization under white radar noise.

C. Proof of Lemma 3

Denote $\boldsymbol{e}$ as the eigenvector corresponding to the smallest eigenvalue of $\sigma_g^2\boldsymbol{R}_x+\boldsymbol{M}$. To maximize $\boldsymbol{s}^H(\sigma_g^2\boldsymbol{R}_x+\boldsymbol{M})^{-1}\boldsymbol{s}$, we should have $\boldsymbol{s}=\epsilon\boldsymbol{e}$. Suppose $\boldsymbol{e}=\boldsymbol{U}\boldsymbol{p}$ where $\boldsymbol{e},\boldsymbol{p}\in\mathbb{C}^{N\times 1}$ and $\|\boldsymbol{p}\|_2=1$. According to the definition of $\boldsymbol{e}$, it need to minimize

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{e}^H(\sigma_g^2\boldsymbol{R}_x+\boldsymbol{M})\boldsymbol{e} &= \sigma_g^2\boldsymbol{p}^H\boldsymbol{U}^H\boldsymbol{U}\boldsymbol{\Gamma}\boldsymbol{U}^H\boldsymbol{U}\boldsymbol{p}+\boldsymbol{p}^H\boldsymbol{U}^H\boldsymbol{V}\boldsymbol{\Phi}\boldsymbol{V}^H\boldsymbol{U}\boldsymbol{p},\\ &= \sigma_g^2\boldsymbol{p}^H\boldsymbol{\Gamma}\boldsymbol{p}+\boldsymbol{p}^H\boldsymbol{Q}\boldsymbol{\Phi}\boldsymbol{Q}^H\boldsymbol{p}, \qquad (67)\end{aligned}$$

where $\boldsymbol{Q}=\boldsymbol{U}^H\boldsymbol{V}$. As $\boldsymbol{U}$ and $\boldsymbol{V}$ are both orthoganal matrices, it is easy to verify that $\boldsymbol{Q}$ is an orthoganal matrix. Obviously, $\boldsymbol{p}^H\boldsymbol{\Gamma}\boldsymbol{p}$ is minimized if $\boldsymbol{p}=[0,0,...,0,1]^T$. To minimize $\boldsymbol{p}^H\boldsymbol{Q}\boldsymbol{\Phi}\boldsymbol{Q}^H\boldsymbol{p}$, $\boldsymbol{p}$ should be the eigenvector corresponding to the smallest eigenvalue of $\boldsymbol{Q}\boldsymbol{\Phi}\boldsymbol{Q}^H$, which is satisfied if $\boldsymbol{U}=\boldsymbol{V}$. In such case, $\boldsymbol{Q}=\boldsymbol{I}_N$ and $\sigma_g^2\boldsymbol{R}_x+\boldsymbol{M}=\boldsymbol{U}(\sigma_g^2\boldsymbol{\Gamma}+\boldsymbol{\Phi})\boldsymbol{U}^H$. It is easy to conclude that $\boldsymbol{s}^H(\sigma_g^2\boldsymbol{R}_x+\boldsymbol{M})^{-1}\boldsymbol{s}$ is maximized when $\boldsymbol{U}=\boldsymbol{V}$ and $\boldsymbol{s}=\epsilon\boldsymbol{u}_N=\epsilon\boldsymbol{v}_N$.

D. Proof of Lemma 4

To show the dependency of the communication rate on the waveform parameters, we use $\boldsymbol{R}_x$ and $\boldsymbol{s}$ as the inputs of communication rates in this subsection, i.e., $R_0(\boldsymbol{R}_x)$ and $R_1(\boldsymbol{R}_f,\boldsymbol{R}_x,\boldsymbol{s})$. For the coherent interference, suppose the point $(R_0(\boldsymbol{R}_x^{(0)}),R_1(\sigma_f^2\boldsymbol{1}_N\boldsymbol{1}_N^T,\boldsymbol{R}_x^{(0)},\boldsymbol{s}^{(0)}))\in\tilde{\mathcal{S}}(\sigma_f^2\boldsymbol{1}_N\boldsymbol{1}_N^T)$ is achieved at $\boldsymbol{R}_x^{(0)}=\boldsymbol{U}^{(0)}\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{(0)}(\boldsymbol{U}^{(0)})^H$ and $\boldsymbol{s}^{(0)}=\epsilon_0\sum_{i=1}^{N-1}\alpha_i^{(0)}\boldsymbol{u}_i^{(0)}$. Then there exists $\boldsymbol{s}^{(1)}=\epsilon_1\boldsymbol{u}_N^{(0)}$ with $0\leq\epsilon_1\leq\epsilon_0$ such that $R_1(\sigma_f^2\boldsymbol{1}_N\boldsymbol{1}_N^T,\boldsymbol{R}_x^{(0)},\boldsymbol{s}^{(1)})=R_1(\sigma_f^2\boldsymbol{1}_N\boldsymbol{1}_N^T,\boldsymbol{R}_x^{(0)},\boldsymbol{s}^{(0)})$. Obviously, the waveform setting $(\boldsymbol{R}_x^{(0)},\boldsymbol{s}^{(1)})$ also enables the communication rate pairs falling inside the achievable region, i.e., $\frac{\epsilon_1}{\sigma_w^2+\sigma_g^2\gamma_N}\geq\tilde{\rho}$.

Adopt the eigenvalue decomposition $\boldsymbol{M}=\boldsymbol{V}\boldsymbol{\Phi}\boldsymbol{V}^H$ where $\boldsymbol{\Phi}=\text{diag}([\phi_1,\phi_2,...,\phi_N])$ with $\phi_1\geq\phi_2\geq...\geq\phi_N\geq 0$, and $\boldsymbol{V}=[\boldsymbol{v}_1,\boldsymbol{v}_2,...,\boldsymbol{v}_{N-1},\boldsymbol{v}_N]$. Since $\text{Tr}(\boldsymbol{M})=N\sigma_w^2$, we have $\sigma_w^2\geq\phi_N$. According to Lemma 2, For fixed $\boldsymbol{\Phi}$, $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}$ and ϵ, $\boldsymbol{s}(\sigma_g^2\boldsymbol{R}_x+\boldsymbol{M})^{-1}\boldsymbol{s}$ is maximized when $\boldsymbol{U}=\boldsymbol{V}$. Hence, if we select $\boldsymbol{R}_x^{(2)}=\boldsymbol{V}\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{(0)}\boldsymbol{V}^H$ and $\boldsymbol{s}^{(2)}=\epsilon_1\boldsymbol{v}_N$, then

$$\boldsymbol{s}(\sigma_g^2\boldsymbol{R}_x+\boldsymbol{M})^{-1}\boldsymbol{s}=\frac{\epsilon_1}{\phi_N+\sigma_g^2\gamma_N}\geq\frac{\epsilon_1}{\sigma_w^2+\sigma_g^2\gamma_N}=\tilde{\rho}. \qquad (68)$$

Hence, the communication rate pairs achieved at $(\boldsymbol{R}_x^{(2)}, \boldsymbol{s}^{(2)})$ also falls inside $\bar{\mathcal{S}}(\sigma_f^2 \mathbf{1}_N \mathbf{1}_N^T)$. Since $(R_0(\boldsymbol{R}_x^{(2)}), R_1(\sigma_f^2 \mathbf{1}_N \mathbf{1}_N^T, \boldsymbol{R}_x^{(2)}$, $(R_0(\boldsymbol{R}_x^{(0)}), R_1(\sigma_f^2 \mathbf{1}_N \mathbf{1}_N^T, \boldsymbol{R}_x^{(0)}, \boldsymbol{s}^{(0)}))$, $(R_0(\boldsymbol{R}_x^{(0)}), R_1(\sigma_f^2 \mathbf{1}_N \mathbf{1}_N^T, \boldsymbol{R}_x^{(0)}, \boldsymbol{s}^{(0)}))$ also falls inside $\bar{\mathcal{S}}(\sigma_f^2 \mathbf{1}_N \mathbf{1}_N^T)$.

For the incoherent interference, we have $\boldsymbol{R}_f = \sigma_f^2 \boldsymbol{I}_N$. Suppose the point $(R_0(\boldsymbol{R}_x^{(0)}), R_1(\sigma_f^2 \boldsymbol{I}_N, \boldsymbol{R}_x^{(0)}, \boldsymbol{s}^{(0)})) \in \tilde{\mathcal{S}}(\sigma_f^2 \boldsymbol{I}_N)$ is achieved at $\boldsymbol{R}_x^{(0)} = \boldsymbol{U}^{(0)} \boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{(0)} (\boldsymbol{U}^{(0)})^H$ and $\boldsymbol{s}^{(0)} = \epsilon_0 \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \alpha_i^{(0)} \boldsymbol{u}_i^{(0)}$. Note that $R_1(\sigma_f^2 \boldsymbol{I}_N, \boldsymbol{R}_x, \boldsymbol{s})$ is not affected by the value of $\sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \alpha_i^{(0)} \boldsymbol{u}_i^{(0)}$. Then there exists $\boldsymbol{s}^{(1)} = \epsilon_0 \boldsymbol{u}_N^{(0)}$ such that $R_1(\sigma_f^2 \boldsymbol{I}_N, \boldsymbol{R}_x^{(0)}, \boldsymbol{s}^{(1)}) = R_1(\sigma_f^2 \boldsymbol{I}_N, \boldsymbol{R}_x^{(0)}, \boldsymbol{s}^{(0)})$. Obviously, the waveform setting $(\boldsymbol{R}_x^{(0)}, \boldsymbol{s}^{(1)})$ also enables the communication rate pairs falling inside the achievable region, i.e., $\frac{\epsilon_0}{\sigma_w^2 + \sigma_g^2 \gamma_N} \geq \tilde{\rho}$.

Adopt the eigenvalue decomposition $\boldsymbol{M} = \boldsymbol{V} \boldsymbol{\Phi} \boldsymbol{V}^H$ where $\boldsymbol{\Phi} = \text{diag}([\phi_1, \phi_2, ..., \phi_N])$ with $\phi_1 \geq \phi_2 \geq ... \geq \phi_N \geq 0$, and $\boldsymbol{V} = [\boldsymbol{v}_1, \boldsymbol{v}_2, ..., \boldsymbol{v}_{N-1}, \boldsymbol{v}_N]$. Since $\text{Tr}(\boldsymbol{M}) = N\sigma_w^2$, we have $\sigma_w^2 \geq \phi_N$. According to Lemma 2, For fixed $\boldsymbol{\Phi}$, $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}$ and ϵ, $\boldsymbol{s}(\sigma_g^2 \boldsymbol{R}_x + \boldsymbol{M})^{-1} \boldsymbol{s}$ is maximized when $\boldsymbol{U} = \boldsymbol{V}$. Hence, if we select $\boldsymbol{R}_x^{(2)} = \boldsymbol{V} \boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{(0)} \boldsymbol{V}^H$ and $\boldsymbol{s}^{(2)} = \epsilon_0 \boldsymbol{v}_N$, then

$$\boldsymbol{s}(\sigma_g^2 \boldsymbol{R}_x + \boldsymbol{M})^{-1} \boldsymbol{s} = \frac{\epsilon_0}{\phi_N + \sigma_g^2 \gamma_N} \geq \frac{\epsilon_0}{\sigma_w^2 + \sigma_g^2 \gamma_N} = \tilde{\rho}. \tag{69}$$

Hence, the communication rate pairs achieved at $(\boldsymbol{R}_x^{(2)}, \boldsymbol{s}^{(2)})$ also falls inside $\bar{\mathcal{S}}(\sigma_f^2 \boldsymbol{I}_N)$. Since $(R_0(\boldsymbol{R}_x^{(2)}), R_1(\sigma_f^2 \boldsymbol{I}_N, \boldsymbol{R}_x^{(2)}, \boldsymbol{s}^{(2)}))$ $(R_0(\boldsymbol{R}_x^{(0)}), R_1(\sigma_f^2 \boldsymbol{I}_N, \boldsymbol{R}_x^{(0)}, \boldsymbol{s}^{(0)}))$, $(R_0(\boldsymbol{R}_x^{(0)}), R_1(\sigma_f^2 \boldsymbol{I}_N, \boldsymbol{R}_x^{(0)}, \boldsymbol{s}^{(0)}))$ also falls inside $\bar{\mathcal{S}}(\sigma_f^2 \boldsymbol{I}_N)$, which accomplishes the proof.

REFERENCES

[1] H. Griffiths and S. Blunt, "T09-Spectrum engineering and waveform diversity," in *Radar Conference, 2014 IEEE*. IEEE, 2014, pp. 36–36.

[2] H. Griffiths, L. Cohen, S. Watts, E. Mokole, C. Baker, M. Wicks, and S. Blunt, "Radar spectrum engineering and management: technical and regulatory issues," *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 103, no. 1, pp. 85–102, 2015.

[3] H. Deng and B. Himed, "Interference mitigation processing for spectrum-sharing between radar and wireless communications systems," *IEEE Transactions on Aerospace and Electronic Systems*, vol. 49, no. 3, pp. 1911–1919, 2013.

[4] F. Hessar and S. Roy, "Spectrum sharing between a surveillance radar and secondary Wi-Fi networks," *IEEE Transactions on Aerospace and Electronic Systems*, vol. 52, no. 3, pp. 1434 – 1448, 2016.

[5] A. Aubry, A. De Maio, M. Piezzo, and A. Farina, "Radar waveform design in a spectrally crowded environment via nonconvex quadratic optimization," *IEEE Transactions on Aerospace and Electronic Systems*, vol. 50, no. 2, pp. 1138–1152, 2014.

[6] A. Aubry, A. De Maio, M. Piezzo, M. M. Naghsh, M. Soltanalian, and P. Stoica, "Cognitive radar waveform design for spectral coexistence in signal-dependent interference," in *Radar Conference, 2014 IEEE*. IEEE, 2014, pp. 0474–0478.

[7] A. Aubry, A. De Maio, Y. Huang, M. Piezzo, and A. Farina, "A new radar waveform design algorithm with improved feasibility for spectral coexistence," *IEEE Transactions on Aerospace and Electronic Systems*, vol. 51, no. 2, pp. 1029–1038, 2015.

[8] A. Turlapaty and Y. Jin, "A joint design of transmit waveforms for radar and communications systems in coexistence," in *Radar Conference, 2014 IEEE*. IEEE, 2014, pp. 0315–0319.

[9] S. D. Blunt, M. R. Cook, and J. Stiles, "Embedding information into radar emissions via waveform implementation," in *Waveform Diversity and Design Conference (WDD), 2010 International*. IEEE, 2010, pp. 000 195–000 199.

[10] A. Hassanien, M. G. Amin, Y. D. Zhang, and F. Ahmad, "Signaling strategies for dual-function radar communications: an overview," *IEEE Aerospace and Electronic Systems Magazine*, vol. 31, no. 10, pp. 36–45, 2016.

[11] A. Hassanien, M. G. Amin, Y. D. Zhang, and B. Himed, "A dual-function MIMO radar-communications system using PSK modulation," in *Signal Processing Conference (EUSIPCO), 2016 24th European*. IEEE, 2016, pp. 1613–1617.

[12] A. Hassanien, M. G. Amin, Y. D. Zhang, F. Ahmad, and B. Himed, "Non-coherent PSK-based dual-function radar-communication systems," in *Radar Conference (RadarConf), 2016 IEEE*. IEEE, 2016, pp. 1–6.

[13] M. Bica, K.-W. Huang, V. Koivunen, and U. Mitra, "Mutual information based radar waveform design for joint radar and cellular communication systems," in *Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP), 2016 IEEE International Conference on*. IEEE, 2016, pp. 3671–3675.

[14] B. Li, A. Petropulu, and W. Trappe, "Optimum co-design for spectrum sharing between matrix completion based MIMO radars and a MIMO communication system," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 64, no. 17, pp. 4562–4575, 2016.

[15] A. R. Chiriyath, B. Paul, G. M. Jacyna, and D. W. Bliss, "Inner bounds on performance of radar and communications co-existence," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 64, no. 2, pp. 464–474, 2016.

[16] A. R. Chiriyath, B. Paul, and D. W. Bliss, "Joint communications and radar performance bounds under continuous waveform optimization: The waveform awakens," in *2016 IEEE Radar Conference*. IEEE, 2016, pp. 2–6.

[17] H. Yin, D. Gesbert, M. Filippou, and Y. Liu, "A coordinated approach to channel estimation in large-scale multiple-antenna systems," *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, vol. 31, no. 2, pp. 264–273, 2013.

[18] O. Simeone, Y. Bar-Ness, and U. Spagnolini, "Pilot-based channel estimation for ofdm systems by tracking the delay-subspace," *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 315–325, 2004.

[19] J. Liu, H. Li, and B. Himed, "Joint optimization of transmit and receive beamforming in active arrays," *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 39–42, 2014.

[20] Z. Chen, H. Li, G. Cui, and M. Rangaswamy, "Adaptive transmit and receive beamforming for interference mitigation," *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, vol. 21, no. 2, pp. 235–239, 2014.

[21] T. M. Cover and J. A. Thomas, *Elements of information theory*. John Wiley & Sons, 2012.

[22] M. M. Naghsh, M. Modarres-Hashemi, S. ShahbazPanahi, M. Soltanalian, and P. Stoica, "Unified optimization framework for multi-static radar code design using information-theoretic criteria," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 61, no. 21, pp. 5401–5416, 2013.

[23] S. Kay, "Waveform design for multistatic radar detection," *IEEE Transactions on Aerospace and Electronic Systems*, vol. 45, no. 3, 2009.

[24] H. V. Poor and O. Hadjiliadis, *Quickest detection*. Cambridge University Press Cambridge, 2009, vol. 40.

[25] E. Grossi and M. Lops, "Space-time code design for MIMO detection based on Kullback-Leibler divergence," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 58, no. 6, pp. 3989–4004, 2012.

[26] S. Blackman and R. Popoli, "Design and analysis of modern tracking systems," *Norwood, MA: Artech House, 1999.*, 1999.

[27] M. Hazewinkel, *Encyclopaedia of Mathematics*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.

[28] M. R. Spiegel, "Mathematical handbook of formulas and tables," 1968.

[29] B. Tang, J. Tang, and Y. Peng, "MIMO radar waveform design in colored noise based on information theory," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 58, no. 9, pp. 4684–4697, 2010.

[30] B. Li and A. Petropulu, "MIMO radar and communication spectrum sharing with clutter mitigation," in *Radar Conference (RadarConf), 2016 IEEE*. IEEE, 2016, pp. 1–6.